CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

MONDAY, April 27, 1998

Washington Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Report: Iraq not complying on weapons

Sanctions unlikely to be lifted

By Joyce Howard Price
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said yesterday that weapons inspectors have found Iraq in violation of U.N. resolutions to destroy biochemical arms, including the highly touted agreement reached with Secretary General Kofi Annan.

The U.N. inspectors' report will be released this week, Mr. Cohen said.

Bill Richardson, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said in an interview yesterday on CNN's "Late Edition" that he's "confident" the Security Council "will not lift sanctions" against Iraq, when it reconsiders that issue today.

"In the area of chemical and biological weapons, we agree with the U.N. inspectors that there's been zero progress," Mr. Richardson said. "Therefore, there's been little justification to lift sanctions."

Iraq needs a clean bill of health from U.N. weapons inspectors, led by Australian Richard Butler, before the international community will lift sanctions imposed after the 1991 Gulf war.

Speaking on "Fox News Sunday," Mr. Cohen said the inspectors' report "indicates that Saddam Hussein has not fulfilled his obligation under existing resolutions, and indeed even the most recent agreement with Kofi Annan."

The defense secretary said inspectors for Unscom, as the U.N. team of experts is known, have "no credible evidence" to support Saddam's claims that he's destroyed an arsenal he previously acknowledged having. That arsenal includes 50 Scud missiles with chemical warheads, 25 missiles armed with biological agents, and four tons of deadly nerve gas.

Right after the Gulf war, the Iraqi leader denied having any "chemicals or biologicals," Mr. Cohen said, but later changed his story once he was "confronted with evidence" from the weapons inspectors.

In other comments in the Fox interview, Mr. Cohen:

• Urged Congress to approve a multibillion dollar emergency spending bill by early May or risk widespread furloughs of some of the Pentagon's 800,000 civilian employees. The bill would replenish Pentagon funds strained by deployments in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Persian Gulf and also would provide relief to U.S. communities hard hit by the winter's El

Cohen warns of layoffs, weapons cuts

USA Today...See Pg. 2

Russia Helping India Extend Range of Missiles, Aides Say

New York Times...See Pg. 2

Antimissile Program's Bumpy Path

As Decision on National Defense System Nears, Fresh Concerns Arise

Washington Post...See Pg. 4

Nino-driven storms.

• Warned that if the government fails to close military bases it no longer needs — an extraordinarily sensitive issue in Congress — the Pentagon would have to cut back on high-tech weapons for the future.

Mr. Cohen said he expects $21 billion in savings, money which he said could pay for 450 new advanced fighter planes or two new aircraft carriers, for example.

"If we don't get those kinds of savings, then those programs will have to be cut back or canceled.... There are no easy choices anymore," he said.

As for Iraq, the agreement brokered in February by Mr. Annan granted Unscom inspectors access to eight presidential sites that previously had been off limits, averting U.S. air strikes against Iraq.

In the Fox interview, Mr. Cohen said all reports indicate inspectors "have not found anything in the so-called eight presidential palaces." But he added, "We should not be mesmerized by the palaces."

"I think it was rather unrealistic for anyone to expect that Saddam Hussein, having had all these months to clean out whatever was in the palaces, would then invite the inspectors in, and we should anticipate they'd find anything," the defense secretary said.

Far more significant, Mr. Cohen said, is the fact that Saddam has failed to prove that he's destroyed all of the chemical and biological weapons he previously acknowledged having.

In his latest report, Mr. Butler says his inspection teams made no progress over the past six months in verifying that Iraq had destroyed weapons of mass destruction.

On CNN, Mr. Richardson said there has been some "positive movement" by Iraq on the nuclear disarmament front. But he said the United States wants to see "more progress" in the areas of nuclear design and in such "concealment issues" as "nuclear exports and uranium enrichment."

Current U.N. sanctions against Iraq will be reviewed by the Security Council this week. According to reports from Mr. Richardson and others, the sanctions are likely to be extended despite Iraq's demand that they be lifted. Under current sanctions, Iraq can only sell a limited quantity of oil to buy goods such as medicine and food.

In Baghdad yesterday, Iraqi Culture and Information Minister Humam Abdul-Khaleq Abdul-Ghafur was quoted as saying today's Security Council meeting should focus only on lifting the U.N. embargo.

Another Iraqi official, Foreign Minister Mohammed Said al-Sahaf, told the New York Times in an interview yesterday that the embargo is slowly eroding and that his country has become the recipient of increased donations of supplies and trade in recent months.

"This is happening whether the Americans like it or not," because other nations are fed up with hurting the Iraqi people, the foreign minister said.

• *This article was based in part on wire service reports.*

Cohen warns of layoffs, weapons cuts

USA Today April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

By Ted Bridis
The Associated Press

WASHINGTON — Defense Secretary William Cohen is urging Congress to approve a multibillion dollar emergency spending bill by early May or risk widespread furloughs of civilian military employees.

Cohen also warned Sunday that if the government fails to close military bases it no longer needs — an extraordinarily sensitive issue in Congress — the Pentagon would have to cut back on high-technology weapons for the future.

Appearing on *Fox News Sunday*, Cohen said he must decide by the first week in May whether to order layoffs. The Defense Department employs around 800,000 civilians.

Last week, President Clinton's budget director urged Congress "to avoid actions that would result in gridlock and be detrimental to our nation."

House and Senate negotiators have been named to work out a final version of the emergency spending legislation, which the administration wants approved by Friday.

The bill would replenish Pentagon funds strained by deployments in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and it would provide relief to communities hard hit by last winter's El Nino-driven storms.

On base closings, Cohen said he expects $21 billion in savings, which could pay for 450 new Joint Strike Fighters, two new aircraft carriers under design, 12 new surface ships or about 600 RAH-66 Comanche helicopters.

"We're talking about real savings here that will go to producing the kinds of systems that we're going to need to keep our forces the superior force in the world," Cohen said. "If we don't get those kinds of savings, then those programs will have to be cut back or canceled. ... There are no easy choices anymore."

The secretary is proposing a round of base closings in 2001 and another in 2005, which would spread the controversial choices across two presidential administrations. He also said Congress should remove the president from having any say in selecting which bases to close, to avoid politicizing the issue.

New York Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Russia Helping India Extend Range of Missiles, Aides Say

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- Russia is helping India to build a sea-launched ballistic missile that can carry a nuclear warhead and strike deep into Pakistan, say senior Clinton administration officials, who fear the program will inflame simmering tensions in South Asia.

The assistance has continued for at least three years, the officials said, despite assurances from Russia that its scientists are not contributing restricted technology to India's missile programs. Vice President Al Gore and other senior administration officials have appealed to Russian officials to halt the support, with little success.

India, which has long had military ties to Russia, has been trying for years to develop a series of more powerful missiles. Although not tested, the sea-launched missile, the Sagarika, whose name means oceanic in Hindi, is said to have a range of nearly 200

miles and is meant to be launched from submerged submarines.

That would be a technological breakthrough for India in its arms race with Pakistan. American intelligence officials regard the simmering rivalry one of the most dangerous flash points for conventional or even nuclear war. The two countries have fought three wars since independence from Britain in 1947.

India has had an extensive nuclear weapons program since it first tested a nuclear device in 1974.

This month Pakistan tested a medium-range missile that can carry a nuclear weapon that would allow it to strike virtually anywhere in India, raising fears over a renewed arms race.

Russia's sale of missiles and missile technology has been one of the more nettlesome obstacles to its improved relations with the United States since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The New York Times reported on Saturday that Russia did nothing to stop a 22-ton shipment of the type of stainless steel used in making missiles on the way to Iran. The shipment was intercepted by customs officials in Azerbaijan just shy of Iranian territory.

Although the administration's concerns have focused on Iran over the last year, the help to India offers another instance of Russia's unwillingness or inability to control exports of missile technology and suggests a wider pattern of proliferation, the officials and arms experts said.

"Clearly this cooperation with India raises questions," said a senior administration official who, as with the others, insisted on anonymity because of political sensitivities and to protect American intelligence sources.

The precise nature of Russia's aid is not clear, the officials said. The administration first approached Russia with its concerns as early as the spring of 1995. At that time, the officials said, Russia acknowledged that scientists from quasipublic research institutes that grew out of the Soviet military-industrial complex were providing technological help for the Sagarika missile.

But the Russians insisted that the assistance was limited and involved only the technology needed to launch a missile from beneath the sea's surface, the officials said.

"We had rather extensive discussions, and the Russians told us that there was some cooperation between Russian entities and the Indians, but that the cooperation was very circumscribed," the senior administration official said.

The administration received "certain commitments" that the Russian role did not involve the missile design and that it "would continue to be circumscribed," the senior administration official said.

Since then, however, intelligence reports have continued to raise questions about Russia's involvement, the official and others said. Another official who tracked the reports said the help had included "significant engineering services," as well as parts and equipment necessary to build and launch the missile.

The assistance appears to violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the 1993 agreement between Russia and the United States to stop helping India or any other country develop ballistic-missile technology.

At that time, Russia canceled a Soviet-era sale of equipment and technology to India that could have been used to build a ballistic missile, and it agreed to adhere to the Missile Technology Control Regime, an agreement among 29 major nations to restrict the spread of missiles.

In exchange, the Clinton administration agreed to lift sanctions that the Bush administration had imposed on the Russian and Indian space-research programs, clearing the way for American and Russian cooperation on space and satellite programs.

In the State Department, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency, officials are divided about whether Russia's assistance violates the missile regime, which could prompt sanctions against both Russia and India.

Some officials have concluded that the help with the Sagarika is a clear violation. Others say it slips under the limits of the agreement.

The intelligence reports, the officials said, have also left uncertainties, with some suggesting that the Sagarika is a less sophisticated cruise missile and not a ballistic missile, although either could fall under the regime's restrictions.

A senior Defense Department official said even if Russian help did not necessarily violate the regime, the cooperation has still raised concerns that India is close to mastering technology that would significantly improve its arsenal of missiles, which are now relatively primitive. After that, India could quickly build longer-range missiles.

"The key sensitivity is that the Indians will learn how to launch something from under water -- get it above the water and ignite an engine," the official said. "And then they'll go to the next step after that on their own, something with a longer range."

Henry Sokolski, the executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center who was a Pentagon official under President Bush, said any assistance from Russia to the Sagarika was troubling, even if it did not explicitly violate the agreement's terms.

"Whether it comes up to the edge or over the edge, it's clearly objectionable," said Sokolski, who has criticized the Clinton administration for not strictly policing proliferation. "Anything that encourages the Indians to play around with strategic technology is bad business."

A spokesman at the Russian Embassy in Washington, Mikhail Shurgalin, declined to discuss the missile, except to say, "We fully comply with our commitments under this regime."

Officials at the Indian Embassy did not respond to telephone inquiries.

India has had a variety of missiles and missile programs, including one to develop a sea-launched ballistic missile. But it has always maintained that the programs are indigenous, and it has not acknowledged the Russian help to the Sagarika.

Arms experts say the Indian Defense Research Development Organization has been working on the Sagarika for much of the 1990s. Although its range of nearly 200 miles would classify it as a short-range missile, it is a solid-fueled missile, making it an advance over India's liquid-fueled missile, the Prithvi.

The Sagarika is being developed in conjunction with fitful efforts by India over the last decade to build a nuclear-powered ballistic submarine, the officials and experts said. In 1988, India leased a nuclear-powered submarine from the Soviet Union, but returned it in 1991, presumably after having studied its technology. A submarine-launched missile would allow India to extend its missile range greatly, theoretically allowing it to strike from around the globe. A submarine-launched missile, because of its mobility and underwater stealth, would also be less vulnerable to attack than land-based missiles.

The Indian submarine program, however, has been plagued with problems, and administration officials played down the likelihood that the Sagarika could become a reality soon. Still, experts said, India could also put the missile aboard other warships or easily refit it to launch from land, making it a more immediate concern.

Whether launched from sea or land, the missile could carry a nuclear warhead, though it is not clear that India has built one small enough to fit atop a missile, the officials said.

India's new nationalist government, led by Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, announced in March that it would review the country's nuclear policy and consider introducing nuclear weapons to its arsenal. Since then, the new government has moderated its remarks.

The Indian defense minister, George Fernandes, announced on April 14 that the government had developed a naval version of the Prithvi with a range of nearly 220 miles.

Wall Street Journal
Apr. 27, 1998
Pg. 1

Former Yeltsin aide Lebed was locked in a tight Siberian gubernatorial race and appears headed for a May 17 runoff against a popular local candidate. Lebed, who ran a strong third in the 1996 presidential race, wants the post as a platform for a new bid.

Washington Post April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Antimissile Program's Bumpy Path

As Decision on National Defense System Nears, Fresh Concerns Arise

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

DOWNEY, Calif.—In the same cavernous building where Apollo modules were assembled three decades ago to carry men to the moon, a different sort of space vehicle is taking shape to fulfill a dream not of extending America's space frontier but of guarding it.

The exotic device, four feet long and meant to fit on top of a rocket, is designed to search out and crash into enemy warheads racing toward the United States. Engineers at the Boeing Co. facility here exude confidence that the ingenuity, purpose and resources that infused the moon mission can also finally make missile defense a success after years of aborted starts and flight test failures.

But America's path to build a reliable interceptor missile and erect a national shield remains far more tentative and troubled than was the contest to beat the Russians to the moon.

Fifteen years and $50 billion after President Ronald Reagan put forward his vision of a "Star Wars" defense, the United States still lacks the means for blocking an intercontinental ballistic missile. Nearly $1 billion continues to be spent annually on developing a national system to protect U.S. territory and another $3 billion or so on battlefield weapons to safeguard U.S. troops abroad. In all, more than a half-dozen programs have sprung up under the missile defense umbrella, consuming more research and development money than any other category of weaponry.

As the Clinton administration edges closer to a decision on whether to field a modest national antimissile system, basic questions that have dogged the development effort since its inception are driving renewed political debate: Will the technology work? Is the system really necessary? Is it worth the expense? Will the weapons jeopardize the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty signed with Moscow?

Fresh concerns arose last month when a panel of independent experts appointed by the Pentagon reported that missile defense work in recent years has been marred by poor planning, insufficient testing and political pressure to hasten inauguration of the systems. Warning against a "rush to failure," the panel said decisions to accept abbreviated timetables and minimal numbers of flight tests have heightened the risk of more failures, delays and cost overruns.

Defenders of the plan to build a national shield fault politics for slowing the program. They blame delays on the absence of a firm commitment to the project and on shifts in the focus of research -- from elaborate space-based arsenals in the Reagan years, such as orbiting lasers, electromagnetic "cannons" and "Brilliant Pebbles" satellites, to the predominately ground-based architecture now favored by the Clinton administration.

The more ambitious designs pursued in the 1980s to thwart a massive attack have left some technological legacy in improved radars, infrared sensors and composite materials being incorporated in today's model. But the collapse of the Soviet Union lessened the sense of urgency at the start of the 1990s and prompted both a scaling back of designs and more political bickering.

"The reason things have been moving slowly is that not all the key players see this as important to do in a big hurry," said Greg Canavan, a senior scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, who helped conceive the now-defunct "Brilliant Pebbles" program. "There has been a lot of bureaucratic jockeying and not a great deal of consensus among the political players."

John Peller, Boeing's program manager for national missile defense, called the current program "less technically challenging" than reaching the moon or even inventing the space shuttle, which he supervised during the 1970s. "The shuttle is a rocket, a spacecraft, a re-entry vehicle and an airplane all rolled into one," he said, "while the [missile interceptor] is a rocket with a smart front end."

Still, whether that "smart front end" can reliably find and ram into a target traveling several times faster than a bullet remains unproven. Prototype interceptors have failed to score hits routinely under benign conditions, let alone under the stressful circumstances of combat.

In 20 intercept attempts over the past decade using various designs, only seven missiles struck their targets. The last success occurred in 1994, followed by six failures, according to a history provided by the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

"It's an absurd notion that if only we had the national will, this stuff would work," said Stephen Schwartz, a defense analyst with the Brookings Institution in Washington. "There's a 'Field of Dreams' aspect to this approach, an attitude of, 'Build it and it will work.' "

The Clinton administration has not committed to deploying a national shield, but under pressure from Republican lawmakers it has promised to accelerate development. In a 1996 deal with Congress known as the "three-plus-three" plan, the administration agreed to spend three years designing and testing a system that could be fielded within another three years if the go-ahead is given in 2000 at the earliest. The Pentagon intends to take a further step toward deployment this week by announcing the selection of either Boeing or a joint venture -- formed by Lockheed Martin Corp., Raytheon Co. and TRW Inc. -- to coordinate the program.

Despite the test failures, those closest to the development effort profess an unshaken belief that using a missile to hit another missile -- a concept dubbed "hit to kill" -- can work.

Advances in sensor technology and computer chips, they say, have opened the way to overcoming what had been the biggest scientific hurdle: creation of a relatively lightweight "exoatmospheric kill vehicle" that can be launched atop a booster rocket, identify a target in space and maneuver itself into a collision. The basic challenge now, according to these experts, is integrating individual pieces -- interceptors, tracking radars and command and control networks -- into a whole system.

Most of the failed intercept tests in recent years, they say, can be attributed not to poor design but to lapses in quality control -- such as an improperly installed cable or a computer software error -- that should have been caught in preflight checks.

"There are no more scientific unknowns from this

point," said Shell Wald, program manager for Raytheon's "kill vehicle," which is competing against Boeing's version. "It's just a matter of straight engineering. We are so close, I could taste it. It's no longer a question of if, but when."

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen defended the large sums being poured into the project, including an additional $2.3 billion over five years he ordered last year. He said the proliferation of missile technology around the world made the U.S. defensive effort necessary.

"I'm counting on American technology to be able to do this," he said in an interview Friday. "It is a real challenge, but in so many other areas, we've measured up to the challenge. I'm determined to make every effort to see if we can achieve this."

A Political Weapon

After Reagan launched his missile defense quest in a 1983 nationally televised address, the initiative became a potent political weapon long before the emergence of any viable military one. Capturing the imagination of Americans and the fearful attention of the Soviets, the program eventually won credit for hastening the end of the Cold War by persuading Soviet leaders they could not compete with ambitious U.S. military plans.

Following the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the Bush administration reduced the scope of missile defense work. Clinton ordered further cutbacks in 1993, consigning national missile defense to back-burner research status.

The Pentagon concentrated instead on developing shorter-range antimissile defenses for troops in the field. Iraqi Scud missile attacks during the 1991 Persian Gulf War had underscored the urgency of the short-range threat. At the time, the only countermeasure available to U.S. troops were Army Patriot batteries, originally designed to shoot down aircraft.

Republican lawmakers made the revival of national missile defense a main tenet of their "Contract With America" in 1994. Since regaining control of the Congress, Republicans have added hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the administration's proposed missile defense budgets, pushing for speedier development of national and shorter-range systems.

By agreeing to intensify work on a national system under the "three-plus-three" schedule, the administration disarmed GOP critics in 1996 and undercut a Republican attempt to make missile defense an issue in the last presidential election.

But the system being designed is far more modest than Reagan's vision of an expansive space-based umbrella that was supposed to make the United States impregnable to thousands of enemy missiles. The current plan is to build a "limited" defense, relying on about 20 interceptors initially, to block whatever few missiles might be launched intentionally by "rogue" nations such as North Korea and Libya or accidentally by major powers such as Russia and China.

Further, as part of the deal with Congress, the administration has insisted on making any deployment decision highly conditional.

"The decision is supposed to be based on four factors," said Sen. Carl M. Levin of Michigan, the senior Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, who helped craft the compromise plan. "What is the threat by the time development is completed? How effective is the system? What would it cost to deploy? And would it violate the ABM Treaty, prompting the Russians to refuse to dismantle nuclear weapons under other arms control accords?"

GOP lawmakers are pushing to redefine these terms and shove the administration out of its wait-and-see posture. In a strict party-line vote last Tuesday, the Senate Armed Services Committee endorsed legislation that would commit the United States to deploying a national system "as soon as is technologically possible." The bill makes no mention of treaty implications, threat assessments or cost.

"I don't think we should wait until we think we have the best and most perfect system before we deploy something to protect our security interests," said Sen. Thad Cochran (R-Miss.), who sponsored the bill.

Why the rush?

Despite the Cold War's end, missile defense proponents say there is still a possibility of accidental or unauthorized launch from Russia or China. Even more worrisome, they say, is a growing threat from such potential adversaries as North Korea and Iran that are engaged in buying or building longer-range missiles.

North Korea, with its Taepo Dong 2 missile, is reported to be closest to developing a weapon capable of reaching at least Alaska and parts of Hawaii, possibly within the next several years. The spread of missile technology and the willingness of Russia and China to provide technical assistance increases the likelihood that other nations will obtain similar arsenals, perhaps soon, antimissile system supporters say.

U.S. intelligence agencies have generally taken a less alarming view, predicting that intercontinental missile threats from Third World countries may not materialize for a decade or more. These estimates, however, come hedged increasingly with references to "gaps and uncertainties," as George J. Tenet, the director of central intelligence, told Congress last year.

Opponents of a national antimissile system argue there are ways of countering foreign missile proliferation without constructing an expensive shield that may not guarantee protection. These include arms control accords and tighter limits on technology transfers.

U.S. military leaders, for their part, appear in no hurry to commit to deployment of a national system.

"Given the substantial intelligence resources being devoted to this issue, I am confident that we will have the three years' warning on which our strategy is based," said Gen. H. Hugh Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, in a letter to Congress last week.

For some, such differing assessments have made it difficult to balance the threat and the costs of the program. Just setting up a rudimentary national antimissile system would require about $5 billion beyond development expenses, according to various estimates. If that architecture is then expanded to include space-based components, as some proponents have in mind, the bill could expand by another $60 billion, according to a Congressional Budget Office calculation.

U.S. officials also must factor in the price of two advanced battlefield antimissile systems under development -- the Army's Theater High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD) and Navy's Theater Wide systems. The Air Force, too, is determined to be in on the action, looking at using airborne lasers to zap enemy missiles soon after launch.

While some lawmakers view the multiplicity of programs as needlessly expensive, the overlaps reflect in part strong political differences on Capitol Hill between members such as Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) and Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) who prefer land-based systems, and others led by Rep. Bob Livingston (R-La.) who favor a sea-based approach. Further, Pentagon officials say each program has a valid military rationale.

Congressional Republicans hold out little prospect of pruning. House and Senate staff members involved in setting defense budgets said there is little incentive even to look closely at where all the money is being spent.

"On the whole, this Congress hasn't been willing to fine-comb the budgets," said one Senate aide. "My mandate hasn't been to figure out what's the right amount. It's been to throw more money into it."

Much of the $1.3 billion that Congress has added over the past three years for developing the national system has gone into extra spare parts, extra testing and a prolonged competition between Boeing and Raytheon for the "kill vehicle" contract. Another $566 million was funneled into the Navy's Theater Wide program, with smaller amounts added to other shorter-range systems.

Missile defense proponents also have not been deterred by the ABM Treaty that limited antimissile development. The treaty sought to create a more stable balance of nuclear terror, on the theory that deployment

of a defensive system by one power would spur the other to build more missiles.

"I'll concede the policy may have kept us all from blowing one another up, but now it has no relevance," said Livingston, the House Appropriations Committee chairman. "We don't have an interest in what the Russians will do when it comes to protecting our own people against external threats that may not come from the Russians."

The administration has argued for preserving the treaty to prevent Russia from reneging on commitments to reduce its nuclear arsenal and to avoid inciting a missile buildup in China. The treaty permits a single site with no more than 100 interceptors, far from sufficient to thwart a massive attack.

Technology's Foundation

On the corporate engineering teams involved in designing the national system are people who have pursued the missile defense dream for years. Their latest plan for the ground-based interceptor, they say, builds on the legacies of earlier programs with such names as HOE, FLAGE, ERIS, ERINT and LEAP.

"The interceptor technology work, the radar work that was done, the battle management foundation that was done then, are why we could claim we could do in 2003 a limited system," said Rob Snyder, a senior program planner with the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

The system will rely on some tools already used by the military to monitor potential airborne threats -- including Defense Support Program (DSP) satellites, early-warning radars in England, Greenland and the United States and the U.S. air defense command in Colorado's Cheyenne Mountain. Special X-band radars have been created to improve tracking, and more powerful infrared satellites are due by 2006.

The most critical breakthrough in the past few years, according to program participants, came in development of the "kill vehicle," particularly its ability to spot targets. A 100-pound device lifted into space atop a rocket, it must identify the enemy warhead from all the decoys that are part of advanced ballistic missiles, then fly into it.

Only one flight trial is scheduled to test the integration of the system before the administration must decide whether to place it in operation. Defense officials acknowledge that such limited testing gives the program a "high risk" of future setbacks.

"We don't have a lot of programs that have met that kind of aggressive schedule," said Lt. Gen. Lester Lyles, who heads the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

While eager to finance added tests, missile defense advocates in Congress have resisted further program delays. Taking a lesson from the Apollo effort, they say that along with money and talent, pushing ahead is a matter of faith.

Said Weldon, a senior National Security Committee member: "I can't believe that if President John Kennedy could announce we were going to the moon and we did, we can't solve the problem of missile defense."

Washington Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Close no longer counts in grenades

Female soldiers must equal men

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Army has leveled the playing field for one of the most basic soldiering skills: tossing a hand grenade.

Requiring male and female recruits to throw the explosive the same distance — about 100 feet — is part of a program to introduce added rigor at boot camp. Physical fitness had become so lax in military training that Defense Secretary William S. Cohen expressed his displeasure publicly.

But ending grenade gender-norming stemmed more from the complaints of powerful members of Congress who toured training posts in the aftermath of the Army's sex scandal at the Aberdeen Proving Ground and other training bases.

Rep. Steve Buyer, Indiana Republican and chairman of the House National Security subcommittee on military personnel, returned from his trip to condemn the Army for maintaining one standard for male recruits and a lower one for women.

"I sent a message to the Army last year that I was not pleased with their hand-grenade policy," said Mr. Buyer, an Army reserve officer. "I found that the standard of successfully throwing a hand grenade was being routinely waived for female recruits. This was not acceptable. I am pleased the Army is now enforcing the standard for all recruits, regardless of gender."

Fort Jackson, S.C., one of the Army's two principal mixed-sex training posts, moved to even the test in a complicated policy change.

Recruits throw grenades in two separate settings in the sixth week of an eight-week course. To graduate, each must be able to pull the pin from and throw two live grenades. The distance is not measured, but each must pass the test to graduate.

In the afternoon, they navigate a course, tossing dummy grenades in seven different scenarios. For years, the Army never required a passing grade to graduate. Now it does.

"You had to negotiate it, but you didn't have to pass it," said Col. Jack Carter, chief of staff at Fort Jackson.

"All we said is, 'We have all this training anyway, why don't you have to do it to graduate?' " Col. Carter added. "If anything, it increased the number of kids who are at training on a given day, so more show up. And it was a way to introduce more rigor."

The first stop on the course is the distance test. Previously, women had to hurl the object 75 feet. Now, it must go 100. But even a failing grade may not matter because soldiers can flunk that test, but still graduate by succeeding on at least five other stops on the course.

Col. Carter did not know what percentage of men and women are reaching the 100-foot mark, but he noted that women "are not as good at throwing grenades. You just have to practice more. They're doing OK. There's a lot of folks that can't throw it that far, men and women."

To trainers like Col. Carter, the grenade toss is less important at Fort Jackson than it is at the Army's all-male combat-arms training centers for infantry, tanks and artillery. Soldiers there are trained for direct land combat, from which women are now banned.

Recruits at Fort Jackson and other sex-integrated training centers are preparing for combat support jobs.

"The average soldier will never throw a grenade in anger," Col. Carter said. "So how important is

it for a communications guy or a truck driver to throw a live hand grenade? It is probably not all that crucial. Infantry, yes. But we don't train infantry at Fort Jackson."

The military has moved to toughen training in response to embarrassing news reports and government inquiries that concluded mixed-sex boot camp had gone soft.

The Aberdeen scandal, in which instructors sexually preyed on young female recruits, sparked a reassessment of mixing the sexes at the start of basic training. Citing poor discipline, a Pentagon-appointed commission recommended separating men and women at the small-unit level.

Time May 4, 1998

Sex, The Army And A Double Standard

A general allegedly coerced an officer's wife into an affair. Why did he get off so easy?

By Mark Thompson
Washington

The 50-year-old Army colonel will never forget the way his new boss, Major General David Hale, laid eyes on his wife, Donnamaria Carpino, that day in Turkey. She was among the guests of honor at a summer cocktail party in 1996 welcoming new arrivals to a NATO military post in Izmir. "The first time he saw her, he broke out into a sweat," says the 29-year veteran. "It was obvious that he was in heat." But the colonel says he tucked away his concerns: "I presumed he was an officer and a gentleman."

Wrong presumption. Within four months, Hale had allegedly blackmailed Carpino, a civilian, into having a sexual relationship with him. Then, when both her marriage and the affair began to break up, Hale switched allegiance and offered to testify in the divorce case that she was an unfit mother. Yet when Pentagon officials found out about his alleged manipulations, he got away clean. Instead of facing retribution, the two-star general was allowed to retire quietly. His getaway so infuriated the Army colonel and his ex-wife that they have formed a temporary alliance and are going public with their accusations against Hale. The case is likely to cause further upheaval in the Pentagon, which is still suffering the aftershocks of the sexual-misconduct cases of Sergeant Major of the Army Gene McKinney and Air Force Lieut. Kelly Flinn.

Hale is the best evidence to date that when it comes to adultery, the Pentagon has two standards--one applies to the powerful and another to the grunts. Flinn found herself facing nearly 10 years in jail for conducting an affair with a married civilian (and lying about it); McKinney faced a court-martial for attempting to coerce six women into sex. Last March a military jury cleared him of 18 of the 19 charges. During the month-long trial, McKinney tried to say that he was the target of overly harsh prosecution and that top officers facing similar charges were dealt with gently. His argument was barred from the courtroom by the judge. In the Hale case, the claim of a double standard is being made by the alleged victim and taken directly to the public.

Pentagon brass would have had good reason to dispense quietly with Hale's case, because his alleged offenses made a mockery of the sensitive new job he had been given. The 52-year-old Hale was allowed to pack it up just four months after he became the Army's deputy inspector general. In that post, he oversaw all Army probes into personnel misconduct and was expected to help eradicate sexual abuse in the Army's ranks. "There are two systems of justice in the military, and those who practice in the military justice system are deluding themselves if they say otherwise," says Charles Gittins, the attorney for both Carpino and McKinney. "The troops in the field sure know it."

Defense Secretary William Cohen has ordered a review of the entire case. But even before it is taken up, top Pentagon civilians are seething at the Army's public relations blunder and the demoralizing impact the handling of the case could have on the troops. "You don't let someone go until the inspector general has finished the investigation," says a senior civilian overseeing Pentagon personnel matters. Says Lawrence Korb, a former Pentagon personnel chief: "It was stupid for them to let him out. There's no certainty they can get him back if they decide he needs to be punished." Even a senior Army officer concedes, "If we'd known back then what we know now about the severity of the charges, we'd probably have kept him on active duty."

Army officers close to Hale's boss, Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer, have been quick to speak up for the retired general. They acknowledge that they don't know for sure what occurred between him and Carpino. But their comments, designed in part to protect Reimer, the Army's top general, betray a willingness to disparage a female accuser. They suggest it was Carpino who was the harasser, the one "stalking" Hale. The general, they say, wanted to retire quickly to avoid dragging himself and the Army through the mud. "She thought she was going to get to marry a general, so she dumped the colonel," an Army officer volunteers. "But Hale apparently didn't live up to her view of his obligation, so the hell-hath-no-fury syndrome took over."

Hale's career began with great promise, both as a soldier and as a seducer. "Intelligence, ambition, and a huge capacity for consuming alcoholic beverages, coupled with an ability to handle members of the opposite sex, have combined to make Dave one of the most respected cadets in the corps," was the assessment of West Point's 1967 yearbook, The Howitzer. He earned a Purple Heart and a Silver Star in Vietnam, and was regarded as a good and affable officer. An avid hunter, Hale insisted that his troops--and their spouses--call him Dave, even when he was wearing his uniform with the pair of stars on each shoulder.

His slide into early retirement began after Carpino arrived in Turkey with her husband and their five-year-old son Nico. The colonel--who does not want his name used because the scandal might hinder his effort to find a civilian job--was serving as the deputy to Hale, the senior U.S. officer in NATO's Allied Land Forces, Southeastern Europe command. Because Hale was divorced, Carpino, 44, was the senior Army spouse among the 150 military families in Izmir. Hale often called upon her to help him entertain, filling the traditional role of the senior officer's wife.

Carpino alleges that Hale forced her into a sexual relationship in early 1997 by telling her that her husband was involved in an adulterous affair of his own. She says Hale told her he would protect his deputy from a possible court-martial only if Carpino went to bed with him. "He controlled our employability, controlled where we lived and how we lived," Carpino says. "He controlled everything in our life." She says she felt blackmailed and complied. Most of their dozens of trysts over the next four months occurred during the day at his handsome government apartment. He would often arrive in a chauffeur-driven, armored white Mercedes limousine, she says. Carpino's marriage, already shaky, grew more so. "I'm disappointed that Donna couldn't tell me about the pressure she was getting from this guy," her former husband says.

Carpino says Hale encouraged her to divorce her hus-

band, offered her $2,000 to help pay for a lawyer and expressed a desire to marry her. She presented her husband with divorce papers last June. But the relationship between Hale and Carpino collapsed soon thereafter, she says, when Hale admitted to her that the story of her husband's affair was a lie. Carpino said she vowed then to get even, and the two began waging war on each other. Carpino's ex-husband remembers Hale's calling him to say he would help him gain custody of his son. When the colonel explained he needed to demonstrate Carpino was an unfit mother, the general allegedly offered to testify in court to that effect.

Carpino filed a complaint about Hale's actions with Army investigators on Jan. 22. Because of Hale's rank, they turned the case over to the Pentagon's inspector general. Shortly after learning of it, Hale submitted his request to leave the military; he was honorably discharged by Reimer a week later, on Feb. 28.

His treatment was no big surprise to those familiar with the kid gloves the Army uses to handle its top officers, under a system designed to insulate them from the grilling routinely faced by their subordinates. Unlike personnel decisions for the other 485,000 people in the Army, those involving the service's 307 generals are dealt with by a separate general officer management office under Reimer's purview.

Even so, Hale should not have been let off that easily. Army regulations require that the personnel folders of soldiers under investigation be pulled from the Army's regular files and "flagged" to "guard against the accidental execution of specified favorable personnel actions." The rules say that retirement is "prohibited" until the flag is removed. But Army officers working for Reimer say Hale got no special protection. They say that because Reimer knew Hale was under investigation, Hale's file didn't need to be formally flagged. And it was within Reimer's power to issue a waiver allowing Hale to retire in spite of the investigation. "Is Reimer supposed to ask himself for a waiver?" a senior Army officer asks. There was nothing illegal about allowing Hale to retire, the officer argues. Besides, he contends, Hale can always be recalled to active duty to face punishment.

But the Army will have a much tougher time punishing Hale now that he has retired. Responding to a written inquiry from Senator Olympia Snowe of Maine, Army Colonel Scott Black recently wrote that "although retired soldiers remain subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, they are only prosecuted by courts-martial when extraordinary circumstances are present." And senior Pentagon officials say it will be much harder to reduce Hale's rank, and consequently his pension, even if Carpino's charges are substantiated. "Once he's retired, the burden of proof shifts from him to the Army," says Korb, the former personnel chief.

Now that Hale is gone and neither he nor his Army lawyer is willing to speak on his behalf, it is left to his Army buddies to figure out what happened. "This story is so far out of character I can't comprehend what is going on," says Major General Kenneth Simpson, the senior Army officer in Alaska, whom Hale has described as his best friend. When Simpson heard of his friend's sudden retirement, he called Hale at his Army-owned home at Fort Myer, Va., only to get a message saying the phone had been disconnected.

For his part, Carpino's ex-husband wishes he had never taken the assignment in Izmir. "I think we'd still be married if we'd never gone to Turkey and met Dave Hale," he says. "I was loyal to General Hale and to the Army, and they both abused their power." The clue to Hale's gift for easy exits may be contained in the same West Point yearbook entry that cheered his prowess with women and alcohol. It observed that Cadet Dave Hale--much like Major General Dave Hale--had "an expert ability to cover his tracks and a lot of good luck."

Sexual Misconduct: The Penalties They Paid

Sgt. Major of the Army Gene McKinney
The Charge: He was accused of using his position as the Army's highest-ranking enlisted man to try to coerce sexual favors from six women.
The Outcome: After a month-long trial, a military jury acquitted him of all sex-related charges and found him guilty on a single count of obstructing justice. He was demoted to master sergeant.

Air Force Lieut. Kelly Flinn
The Charge: The Air Force's first female B-52 pilot was charged with adultery for having an affair with a married man, then lying about it.
The Outcome: She sought an honorable discharge. The Air Force refused and instead granted her a general discharge, which prevents her from flying in the Air Force Reserve.

Air Force General Joseph Ralston
The Charge: While separated from his wife in 1984, he had an affair with a woman who worked at the CIA.
The Outcome: Ralston was named vice chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1996. He seemed all but assured of winning the job of chairman when word of the affair leaked, dooming his chances.

Army Major General John Longhouser
The Charge: A top officer at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, he had an affair with a civilian woman while separated from his wife in 1992.
The Outcome: A tip about his indiscretion came into a hot line the Army set up following the sex scandal at Aberdeen in 1996. He was questioned about the affair and retired in June 1997.

Inside The Navy April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Would focus joint experimentation

PENTAGON REVIEWING SENATE PROPOSAL FOR NEW JOINT FORCES COMMAND

The Pentagon is warily watching a Senate proposal that could create a new joint command that would have enormous power and a huge influence on the way the individual services equip themselves, train and fight. Crafted by Senate architects of the Quadrennial Defense Review and the National Defense Panel, the proposed legislation could lead to the creation of a Joint Forces Command that would control experimentation to transform the U.S. military, as recommended by the NDP.

According to Pentagon and congressional sources, Sens. Dan Coats (R-IN) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) plan to introduce language during mark up of the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization bill that would call on the Pentagon to create a new command that would supply combat units to commanders-in-chief around the globe and would also be responsible for joint training and exercises, as well as consider future capabilities, concepts and experiments. The initiative is expected to be supported by Sens. John McCain (R-AZ) and Charles Robb (D-VA). All four senators are members of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

"If you're going to transform your force, you have to co-evolve concepts, equipment and organization all at the same time," a congressional source said, describing the goal of the new initiative.

According to military and congressional sources, the proposed language closely mirrors the recommendations

made by the NDP. The panel recommended far-reaching responsibilities for the new command and said it would be "responsible for driving the transformation process (joint requirements approval) for U.S. forces."

Last week, the Pentagon responded with a counterproposal to address some of Coats' and Lieberman's concerns without creating an entirely new command. Talks are ongoing between the Pentagon and Capitol Hill, congressional sources said. "We're not in full agreement yet," one Senate source said. But he did say there was general agreement that more joint experimentation is needed to test nascent service concepts.

According sources, the Pentagon favors giving the responsibility of managing joint experimentation to U.S. Atlantic Command. The NDP instead recommended disestablishing USACOM and creating a new joint command. As the new joint commander, under the NDP's proposal, the new entity would not have geographic warfighting responsibilities, but would concentrate on its lead role as trainer and provider of forces based in the continental United States. The command would also run new labs, training centers and concept development centers, as well as "integrate" existing service battle labs, the NDP recommended.

There is some concern that a large joint boss would absorb and steer service-specific experiments. The NDP cautioned against this and said service innovation would be needed, and congressional sources last week noted service battle labs and experiments would continue to play a large role in the future.

"Although each service may be interested in doing experiments to examine its own role in the future, the real leverage of future capabilities from experiments is in the joint venue," according to the NDP report. "These recommendations do not seek to limit individual service innovation in any way," the report also noted. "Such service-specific innovation is a key component of the military's transformation strategy."

One Senate source echoed those sentiments last week, saying, "Joint experimentation is not a substitute to service experimentation. . . . It's complimentary. We need the competition of ideas."

According to military sources, the proposed language has received high-level interest and has been reviewed by the service chiefs, but opinions are split on its final fate and how the Pentagon would implement such a radical suggestion. "There is a lot of support in the senior [Pentagon] leadership," one congressional source said, noting that officials from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Joint Staff seem more supportive than the individual services "The services are concerned."

Congressional proponents realize that forcing the Pentagon to embrace the new idea could be difficult. "This is something that isn't going to work if Congress crams it down the Pentagon's throat," one congressional source said. "This isn't going to work if the Pentagon doesn't support it."

"If the services lobby to kill it, we probably won't be able to carry it through," he added.

The services are concerned, according to one military source, about the increased authority the new command would have over service-specific topics, and also how the command's activities would be financed. Short of any substantial congressional funding increase for the new command, the services would be pressed to come up with money for the new entity, money that might be taken from service experiments and labs, the source added.

A congressional source said it's not clear how much it will cost to run the new command and pay for all of its experimentation and training activities. "It's not clear to me how much this would cost," another source said. But he added that its operating budget would be "far less" than the budget for U.S. Special Operations Command.

The NDP did not list a cost to implement the new command, but the report did say the Pentagon should spend roughly $5 billion to $10 billion per year to transform the military. Congressional sources said those figures are much higher than what the new command would cost.

The panel suggests that, absent a boost in defense funding, this money could be accumulated through infrastructure and acquisition reform. Without these savings, the money would come from other places, a scenario the services fear. "If these reforms are not forthcoming, it will be necessary to reduce operations tempo, cancel acquisition programs, or reduce force structure and end strength," the panel's report said. -- *Roman Schweizer*

Newsweek May 4, 1998 Pg. 34

The View From the Cockpit

The crew of the warplane that brought down an Italian gondola in a blur of speed and confusion plays defense

By Gregory L. Vistica and Evan Thomas

THE E-MAIL THAT MARINE AVIATOR Capt. Richard Ashby sent his mother on the night of Feb. 3 was terse: "If you've been watching the news, you know about the jet that hit the ski gondola cable. ... I was the one flying the jet. My crew and I are lucky to be alive. We did nothing wrong. ... We didn't see the cable and that's about all I'm allowed to tell you." Ashby's mother, Carol Anderson, learned more when she turned on the TV. Her son's EA-6B Prowler had sliced through a ski-lift cable in an Alpine valley in Italy. A gondola had plunged some 300 feet, killing all 20 people on board. The Italians were demanding a criminal trial for the American pilot and crew. President Clinton had personally reassured Italy's prime minister that the accident would be thoroughly investigated—and that justice would be done.

Early stories strongly hinted that Ashby and his crew—Capts. Joseph Schweitzer, William Raney II and Chandler Seagraves—had been joyriding and hot-dogging. Last week a military judge ruled that Ashby and his crew must face the military equivalent of a grand jury in May and June, and courts-martial are likely to follow. It is far from certain, however, that Ashby and his mates will

be punished. Viewed from the perspective of pilot and crew, the case is less clear-cut than the headlines suggest—and viewed from the courts, the truth about the tragedy may be difficult to determine.

Ashby and his crew, according to sources close to the pilot, had no idea they were heading into a valley with a ski lift strung between its peaks. His military charts showed no cables at that site, though they had been there for more than 30 years. Pilots are generally not supposed to fly below 500 feet on training runs. Crammed with heavy electronic equipment, less maneuverable than a fighter jet, the Prowler is supposed to fly no lower than 1,000 feet. In northern Italy, the minimum was raised last year to 2,000 feet to cut down on noise, but apparently Ashby and his crew didn't get the word. At the preflight briefing the day of the accident, Ashby told his crew that he planned to fly at 1,000 feet at a speed of 450 knots.

Investigators now say Ashby and his crew flew lower and faster—as low as 300 feet, at a speed of up to 550 knots—as the Prowler streaked down valleys and between mountain peaks under a clear, blue sky that afternoon. The crew may indeed have been joyriding, taking a last spin before the end of their six-month tour overseas. Italians living nearby routinely complain about low-flying warplanes buzzing their fields. Still, Ashby is regarded as a by-the-book pilot. A born-again Christian, he was slated to move on from Prowlers to flying the flashier F/A-18 Hornet. He was rusty, though: he had not flown a low-altitude mission in more than seven months. Most of his flying time had been over Bosnia on routine "milk run" patrols.

Ashby's radar altimeter was set to emit a buzzing signal if the Prowler fell below 800 feet. All four crew members told their lawyers they didn't hear the alarm go off. But it is not uncommon for military pilots not to depend on the alarm. On low-level flights in mountainous terrain, pilots prefer to eyeball the peaks and valleys, rather than watch the altimeter.

Ashby never saw the cable. He told investigators that he saw a flash of yellow—the gondola, filled with skiers, just beginning its descent from Mount Cermis—off to his right. He had about a second to react. Jamming the "stick" forward, he pushed the plane's nose down—not up—and to the left. As the Prowler banked, its right wing sliced one cable; the tail caught the other.

Under Marine Corps rules, if a pilot is flying recklessly, crew members are required to call out, "Knock it off." In the Prowler that day, none did. Ashby may have lost what pilots call "situational awareness." Maneuvering in confusing terrain or poor weather, pilots sometimes cannot tell up from down, side from side. Ashby had never flown down this valley before, and he had briefly wandered off course before the accident.

In that first e-mail to his mother, Ashby wrote, "I need your prayers. I'm worried that they are going to make us the scapegoats because it is an international incident. I've been poked and prodded by the U.S. and Italians all day. Haven't eaten or slept. They just gave us something to sleep and that's what I'm going to do now." Ashby has hired an able lawyer, Frank Spinner, and according to his mother, he is spending a lot of time with the chaplain. ■

Defense News April 27- May 3, 1998 Pg. 4

Hackers Claim Heist of Sub-Tracking Software

Experts Warn Network Break-ins Are Turning Into Growing Threat

By GEORGE I. SEFFERS
Defense News Staff Writer

WASHINGTON — An international group of computer hackers says it will demonstrate next month that it has stolen software that can track U.S. Navy submarines.

The group, the Masters of Download, broke into one of the Defense Department's most sensitive global networks last October.

Pentagon and Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) sources confirmed April 23 that the group hacked into the nonclassified portion of the Defense Information Systems Network, a global telecommunications network tied closely to the Global Positioning System, a constellation of satellites on which the military relies for tracking troop movements. However, they downplayed the event's significance.

The Masters of Download is a group claiming to be made up of about 15 hackers from Great Britain, the United States and Russia. The group admitted its software theft April 14 to John Vranesevich, founder of the World Wide Web site known as AntiOnline, devoted to computer security issues.

He posted transcripts of the interviews on the web site at http://www.antionline.com/ April 21 after he said he verified much of what the group claimed.

Vranesevich told *Defense News* April 24 that the group also intends during the first week of May to prove it has filched software for tracking U.S. submarines from a Navy system, a claim the Pentagon so far has been unable to verify.

"We have seen nothing to indicate any classified systems have been jeopardized," Susan Hansen, a Pentagon spokeswoman, said April 23. "It's hard for us to reply to vague claims like this without knowing exactly what it is they say they've got."

A Navy official at the Fleet Information Warfare Center, Norfolk, Va., called the group's assertion "a bold claim," but said April 23 he also could not confirm or deny it.

Vranesevich said the group typically sends him encrypted copies of the information it downloads.

Meanwhile, one expert close to the hacker community told *Defense News* April 24 preliminary evidence indicates the Masters of Download may be a band of young renegade hackers based in New York who probably have more bravado than valuable defense information.

"This younger group [of hackers] that has been raised on computers think they have something hot because it comes from a government agency, but it may be completely meaningless," said Fred Villella, president of New Dimensions International, a Cardiff, Calif.-based Internet security firm that recruits hackers to teach computer security classes. "I think what the Department of Defense says is probably true."

Villella said he believes some of the members have been associated with two earlier but no longer existing groups, the Legion of Doom and Masters of Deception.

A former hacker turned computer security consultant who identified himself as Seven, however, said April 24 that anyone who has been hacking for more than 10 years easily could find out who accomplished the deed. He doubts Masters of Download members are affiliated with the Masters of Deception or Legion of Doom, the latter of which he was a member.

"Most of those guys are married and have kids and jobs, and their attitudes toward hacking have changed," Seven said. "It's bad that [the Masters of Download] got into the DISA system, but maybe it's good that something will finally be done to make it more secure. DoD claims confidential information is protected, but I see confidential in-

formation passed over the Internet all the time."

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said April 23 no classified material was taken; the stolen software poses no threat to the classified system or to military equipment, personnel or readiness; and that DISA has taken steps to deny further access.

The group stole equipment management software for the Defense Information Systems Network and has hinted it will be willing to sell it to foreign governments or terrorist groups. The material, Vranesevich said April 23, included more than 750 files that contained numerous DISA network addresses and passwords.

Despite assurances from the Pentagon, some experts say the hacking episode was too close for comfort.

"If what the hackers said is true, it would be deeply shocking. Even if what DoD has said is true, it is still unnerving and indicative of a long-range trend that keeps getting worse," Ken Allard, senior associate with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a think tank here, said April 23.

The General Accounting Office has estimated the Department of Defense experienced 250,000 hacking episodes in 1995. DISA alone experienced 575 episodes in 1997, up sharply from 53 attempts in 1992 but down from more than 725 in 1996, Bacon said.

Bacon also said the Pentagon will spend $3.6 billion on computer security in the next five years to protect more than 2 million computers and thousands of networks.

An investigation into the episode is being conducted by civilian law enforcement authorities, but some military officials recently have expressed dissatisfaction with their handling of cases involving hacking into Pentagon computers.

Vranesevich said he had not yet been contacted by law enforcement investigators.

Washington Post April 27, 1998 Pg. 9

Interceptor Test Cost To Pass $70 Million

Analysts Urge More Trials After Failures

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

One of the most expensive 30 minutes in weapons testing will occur this fall when a target missile launched from an Air Force base in California arcs west, triggering pursuit by an experimental interceptor fired from a remote atoll in the Pacific Ocean.

Hit or miss, one result of the exercise will be a bill soaring above $70 million, according to Pentagon officials.

As independent analysts urge more flight tests after a string of failures in related intercept programs, the extraordinary cost of these trials is pushing up the overall expense of development. Much of the extra $2.3 billion that the Clinton administration has decided, under pressure from Congress, to pour into the program over the next several years will go for additional flight testing, officials said.

Asked about the costs of a flight test, officials with the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Development Organization provided the following rundown for the first intercept attempt this autumn by a new "exoatmospheric kill vehicle."

The vehicle, mounted atop a booster rocket, will be launched from the Kwajalein Atoll located 2,100 nautical miles southwest of Hawaii, where the Army maintains a testing complex. It is supposed to separate from the booster in space, then search for and ram into the target warhead, which will have been sent skyward from Vandenburg Air Force Base in California.

The vehicle itself costs about $21 million. Its 100 pounds of hardware -- sensors, thrusters, guidance systems, batteries, nuclear radiation shielding -- accounts for only a fraction of the total. Much of the price tag reflects the vast numbers of man-hours invested in designing the vehicle.

The old Minuteman booster that will lift it into space costs about $2 million and will require another $7 million to refurbish with a new electronics package, propulsion gear, guidance mechanisms and navigational controls. Several months of testing the booster, then integrating it with the kill vehicle, will cost $5 million more.

Once the interceptor is assembled, about $8 million will be spent transporting it to Kwajalein and running through two months of preflight testing and several months of post-flight analysis.

The target missile includes a mock warhead and assorted decoys totaling about $7 million. They will be packed in something called a Multi-Service Launch System, costing another $7 million. The price of the booster rocket, plus the fee for use of Vandenberg, comes to $5 million.

Part of the cost of keeping Kwajalein going also must be borne by the test, under Pentagon accounting rules. The facility provides a suite of tracking radars and telemetry systems. Other military resources will be employed to gather test data, including a space surveillance radar on the Hawaiian island of Maui, an early warning radar near Sacramento, an X-band radar at Vandenberg, airborne radars aboard a modified 767 jet called the Airborne Surveillance Test Bed, and Air Force battle management facilities at the Joint National Test Facility in Colorado. Total rental charge: about $5 million.

Finally, the cost for personnel who will record the test and analyze its results will come to about $4 million. This covers room and board for dozens of federal employees and private contractors on Kwajalein for several weeks before and after the test, as well as the salaries of staff based at a program office in Huntsville, Ala.

To limit expenses, the Pentagon has tried relying more on ground tests and computer simulations, but officials say that flight trials still provide an essential measure of performance and reliability.

Another way to trim costs, some suggest, is to make the tests less of a spectacle.

"A lot of what runs up the cost is the mentality of here's a showpiece -- this milestone aura. We make a big deal out of each one," said Bill Loomis, who is heading a joint bid by Lockheed Martin Co., Raytheon Corp. and TRW Inc. to manage the national missile program.

But some basic expenses are just impossible to do anything about.

"I came from the old ICBM world where the target didn't cost anything," said John Peller, who is leading Boeing's pitch for the national missile defense contract. "It was an 'X' in the ocean. But here you have another launch vehicle and another launch complex, which just about makes every test twice as expensive as what you're used to."

NATO Expansion Foes Rally for Senate Votes

Washington Post
April 27, 1998 Pg. 6

Debate on E. European Entries to Resume

By Helen Dewar
Washington Post
Staff Writer

The Senate plans to resume debate over NATO expansion into Eastern Europe today amid intensified efforts by foes to slow what they have called a steamroller pushing toward ratification of the alliance's admission of three former Cold War adversaries.

A vote is planned later this week. Both sides expect it will result in the two-thirds majority needed to give the U.S. blessing to the admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, marking its first expansion in nearly two decades.

Approval of all 16 NATO members is required for expansion, giving the Senate effective veto power over plans to admit the three countries next year to the alliance, which was created a half-century ago to contain expansion of the then-Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact satellites.

Opponents claim to be gaining strength -- "crossing the 20-vote mark," as Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.), a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, put it last week. But they concede that they still fall short of the 34 votes needed to block approval of a resolution of ratification.

The Clinton administration denies any ground has been lost and contends that several senators have moved toward ratification, rather than away from it, since the Senate held a few days of preliminary and largely desultory debate in mid-March.

Many other key players believe little has changed in the past month despite a significant escalation of lobbying by both sides and considerably more focus on the issue by rank-and-file senators.

"I don't think either side has gained. But neither side had really focused on it [in March], so there are naturally more questions about it, although I don't think this will affect the vote," said Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (Del.), ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee and a leading supporter of expansion.

A Senate Republican aide agreed, saying, "There are probably at least 70 votes for it" now, as there were in March.

If there has been any change, senators say it may be to improve prospects for approval of some of the more than 20 proposed amendments to the ratification resolution, especially one submitted by Warner to require a three-year pause before any other countries can be admitted to NATO. At least nine other Eastern European countries are interested in joining, although it may be some time before any are designated for admission, officials have said.

Other proposed amendments would delay NATO membership for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic until they have been admitted to the European Union, curtail the U.S. share of costs to integrate the countries into NATO and bar expansion of NATO's mission beyond the collective defense of members.

Such amendments offer a convenient way for conflicted senators to hedge their bets and could be approved by a simple majority. But the administration opposes any major amendments, as do most leading NATO expansion advocates in the Senate, and officials believe they have the votes to block any potentially crippling ones.

"It's safe to say we're confident we'll have the votes for final passage and to preserve the underlying policy as well," said Jeremy D. Rosner, who is leading the ratification effort for the White House and State Department.

The debate so far has been largely over whether expansion would help or hinder peace and stability in Europe. Proponents contend it would do so in a way that promotes American security, while opponents warn that it could create new divisions, alienate and destabilize Russia, draw the United States into new entanglements and cost much more than the $400 million the Pentagon has estimated would be the U.S. share of expansion costs.

"The most important security priority for the people of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic is not whether they are part of NATO -- it is whether relations between the United States and Russia are cooperative and not confrontational," said Sen. Robert C. Smith (R-N.H.), an expansion foe. "The proposed expansion picks winners and losers out of the former Soviet bloc. This will disrupt the region and the NATO alliance itself."

By contrast, President Clinton -- in a letter to Senate leaders last month urging unconditional approval -- said expansion would "help to erase the Cold War dividing line and contribute to our strategic goal of building an undivided, democratic and peaceful Europe."

One challenge for opponents is the breadth of support for expansion -- including Clinton, former presidents of both parties, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and top Democratic leaders.

A wide array of outside groups such as labor unions and veterans organizations support expansion, as do the Polish and other ethnic communities. Polls have shown little public opposition. The Senate has in recent years has strongly supported expansion, and administration officials, including Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, have campaigned for it.

The popularity of NATO itself gives expansion a boost, Sen. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) noted at a news conference by expansion opponents Thursday: "People say, 'Gosh, NATO's good. . . . What's wrong with expanding it?' " so others can enjoy the benefits, without considering possible adverse consequences.

To cope with this "steamroller coming through the Senate," as Harkin described the push for ratification, opponents have organized a disparate alliance spanning the ideological spectrum of both parties: from Sen. Paul D. Wellstone (D-Minn.) on the left to Smith on the right. Many of them have drawn the choice in stark terms. Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) recently gave a speech titled, "Could NATO Expansion Lead to Nuclear War?"

From outside the Senate, former Armed Services Committee chairman Sam Nunn (Ga.), long an influential Democratic voice on defense policy, opposes NATO expansion, citing concerns about its impact on Russia and efforts to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons. So does a business alliance headed by Ben Cohen, chairman of Ben & Jerry's, which has run ads warning of nuclear holocaust and renewed U.S.-Russian hostilities were expansion approved.

Washington Post April 27, 1998 Pg. 12

Yugoslav Army Ambushes Ethnic Albanians

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia—The Yugoslav army said it stopped 200 suspected ethnic Albanian guerrillas from entering troubled Kosovo Province with a massive amount of weapons. It said it ambushed the separatists, who opened fire on army border guards near the barracks at Gorozup on Pastrik Mountain, 20 miles south of Prizren.

Kosovo has been beset by sporadic violence between Serbian authorities and ethnic Albanians, who outnumber Serbs 9 to 1, since Serbian police action against suspected separatists seven weeks ago killed 80 people, including women and children.

Washington Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Albanian guerrillas are ready to do or die

Will risk everything to liberate Kosovo

By Philip Smucker
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

KUKES, Albania — Ethnic Albanian guerrillas yesterday said they are preparing to fight an all-out war for the "liberation" of Kosovo, just days before the Western powers are to meet to discuss ways of heading off the brewing military confrontation.

Albanian President Fatos Nano meanwhile accused his Yugoslav counterpart of fostering "pathological and traditional violence," in remarks that are bound to worsen tensions between the Balkan neighbors.

Yugoslavia's U.N. ambassador, Vladislav Jovanovic, accused the Albanian government on Friday of giving shelter and support to the Kosovo guerrillas. Albania denied the allegation and put its army and police units on alert the same day.

Western diplomats have already voiced alarm at a Yugoslav army buildup in the mountains along the Albanian border where guerrillas of the separatist Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) have been smuggling men and arms into Kosovo.

Border clashes and attacks on Serbian police stations continued yesterday as Albanian villagers began burying family members killed along the border last week.

Serbs control the army, police and political power in the southwestern Yugoslav province, even though they are outnumbered 9-to-1 by ethnic Albanians.

Lashing out at Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's criticism of the KLA, Mr. Nano said on Albanian state television that the group's activities are not terrorism but "actions of self-defense against Serbian pathological and traditional violence."

KLA sources interviewed in Albania said they were preparing for an all-out fight for the "liberation" of Kosovo.

"We are evacuating women and children from the area, but the men with guns will remain and fight," said Rruzdhi Saramati, who spoke in the city of Kukes, Albania.

"We will fight with our Kalashnikovs and capture their guns — the same as the Muslims did in Sarajevo," he vowed.

The core of the KLA are young Albanians with military experience in the Yugoslav National Army before its disintegration in 1991 and 1992. Some of its older revolutionaries such as Mr. Saramati escaped from prison in Kosovo years ago and fled into the mountains of neighboring Albania to continue their struggle against the Serbs in Kosovo.

European and U.S. officials accuse the Yugoslav army of using excessive force in a failing effort to crush the Albanian resistance.

Led by the United States, they have threatened harsh sanctions on Yugoslavia if it does not negotiate with the Kosovo Albanian leaders and will meet later this week to discuss the next steps.

In a referendum staged last week by Mr. Milosevic, Serbian voters opted overwhelmingly to reject foreign mediation, strengthening the Yugoslav government's hard-line stance.

In recent days, the Yugoslav army appears to have cut many of the mule paths used by the KLA as an "underground railway" for men and arms into the region. It has taken up strategic positions on hills and forced many Albanian villagers to flee, some into Albania.

The Yugoslav army said yesterday it ambushed a group of about 200 guerrillas as they tried to cross into Kosovo. A correspondent for Reuters was flown to the scene by helicopter and shown cases of ammunition and explosives strewn across the mountain slope.

"Fire was returned and the Albanian terrorists fled back to Albania in panic, leaving behind more than 120 cases of mines and explosives and other military equipment," said a duty officer at the scene.

There were also reports from Serbian sources that guerrillas had attacked two Serbian-controlled police stations. A policeman was slightly wounded by a bazooka fired at a police checkpoint in Kijevo, about 20 miles west of the provincial capital, Pristina.

Nearly 2,000 ethnic Albanians turned out yesterday in the Kosovo village of Shluk for the funeral of nine men killed by the Yugoslav army last week. The army said the men were killed while smuggling arms into Kosovo but villagers insisted some of them had been captured before being killed.

Sources in Kukes also told Western diplomats they had witnessed executions last week along the Albanian border after Yugoslav army units seized control of the town of Kosare, which is about 1 mile inside Yugoslavia.

"The incident is reported to have been seen by Albanian military officials in the nearby village of Gegaj," said a British official with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

"Three men were beaten to death and another tied to a pole in a field and shot by Yugoslav soldiers," they said.

Washington Times
April 27, 1998
Pg. 6

Inside Politics

Compiled by Greg Pierce

Job security

Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen said yesterday that Linda Tripp has no reason to fear for her job at the Pentagon.

An attorney for Mrs. Tripp has said she is afraid the Defense Department will fire her from her public relations job in retaliation for bringing to light Monica Lewinsky's supposed sexual dalliances with President Clinton.

"She is not going to lose her job," Mr. Cohen said on "Fox News Sunday."

"As far as I'm concerned, she is performing a job, working at home for the time being. But there's been no indication on our part that she should have this fear. She's working at home in order to work out her particular arrangement, which is a sensitive one now; namely, she's still working with the independent counsel. And so it was worked out between management and her that she could work at home, at least for a temporary period of time. But there's no plan to fire her."

Mr. Cohen also expressed unhappiness over the fact that a Pentagon public information officer had released details from Mrs. Tripp's government personnel file.

"We think it's certainly inappropriate, if not illegal, and we called for an investigation into how that occurred . . ." Mr. Cohen said.

Rocket launchers lost and found

Washington Times
Apr. 27, 1998
Pg. 19

By William Lynn

In any complex business or policymaking environment, symbols have an inevitable appeal. They are an easy shorthand — an attempt to promote understanding of concepts or issues that may otherwise require a time or patience that those not steeped in the subject are unwilling to give. However, in some cases, symbols or anecdotes can complicate, rather than clarify, an issue. Recent stories that imply that the Department of Defense cannot keep track of its assets or expenditures are a case in point.

Last week, reports that the Pentagon had lost an Army missile launcher and 200 Air Force cruise missiles had Washington officials and pundits shaking their heads about deficiencies in the Department's financial and other systems. In fact, neither the launcher nor the missiles were ever lost.

The issue in both instances is not physical control of military equipment, but up-to-date paperwork. It's like being accused of losing your car if you don't have your ownership title at hand.

The missile launcher, which has a serial number, was mounted on a vehicle with its own serial number. Both the launcher and the vehicle had been listed under the vehicle's serial number. Ultimately, the two were sent to separate destinations — the vehicle to Pennsylvania, the launcher to New Mexico. Because the property records had both still listed under the same serial number, the property records did not disclose the new location of the launcher. But the Army can identify its new location in New Mexico by using the separate serial number of the launcher.

Neither were the 200 cruise missiles ever missing. Records of critical weapons systems such as these are maintained in more than one database system. The missiles, which had been destroyed in compliance with a treaty with the former Soviet Union, had properly been deleted from two of the three databases that maintain records on cruise missiles, although that fact had not yet been reflected in the third. Those responsible in the Department knew the status of the missiles, knew they were not lost, and knew they had been destroyed.

The anecdotes miss the real point: the Pentagon needs to improve its finance and accounting systems. We are working hard to do just that, but the task is daunting.

Because of the Pentagon's unique requirements and size, we have many different and overlapping systems. We know we have too many, and we've been taking steps to eliminate and consolidate those systems. In 1993, there were 324 separate finance and accounting systems in the Department of Defense. We have cut that number by more than half, and by 2003 we will cut it to 32 — coordinated by the new Defense Finance and Accounting Service, which centralized the Department's finance and accounting functions into a single agency. Consolidating finance and accounting systems and operations will reduce the number of inconsistencies and communication problems that led to some of the past record-keeping errors.

We are also upgrading the financial systems that are needed to support new accounting standards. For 200 years, the primary purpose of military accounting systems was to ensure that appropriated funds were spent as Congress directed. This resulted in a focus on information central to budget decisions, but not adequate for commercial-type accounting.

In recent years, Congress and the executive branch directed the implementation of new federal-wide accounting standards and required auditable financial statements. The old financial systems were not designed to collect the type of information on the value of assets and liabilities required for a commercial audit and thus fall short in meeting the new standards. We are now in the middle of the decade-long effort that it will take to fully upgrade these financial systems.

Let me caution that audit requirements can be taken to unreasonable extremes. Some audit standards could necessitate documentation of the original cost of the Department's bases as far back as the Civil War. It is surely misleading to question late-20th century financial statements because we cannot produce receipts for expenses incurred in the middle of the 19th century. Similarly, some audit standards could require the Department to record an expense when ammunition is actually consumed, rather than when it is procured. This could put needless requirements on operational units to know not only at what they were shooting but how much each bullet costs.

We know that the federal auditors aren't asking us to send an accountant to combat with each battalion, nor asking each soldier to check when each bullet has been manufactured before loading and firing at the enemy — just as we know we haven't lost missiles or launchers. We are also working hard to improve our performance to maintain effective internal management controls and to provide accurate and reliable financial information. The initiatives I've outlined add up to the most comprehensive reform of financial management and practices in the Defense Department's history.

We are strongly committed to ensuring that these reforms allow us to meet the new requirements to provide auditable financial statements. But we are not in the business of paying dividends, issuing bonds or reporting earnings. We need sound financial statements to show the American people that we have the necessary internal management controls to provide proper stewardship over the substantial taxpayer dollars that go to national defense. We also need to pursue financial management reform in a rational way that supports rather than detracts from our overriding responsibility to protect the nation's security.

William Lynn is Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer of the United States Department of Defense.

New York Times April 27, 1998

The Senate Should Halt NATO Expansion

By John Lewis Gaddis

NEW HAVEN -- The decision to expand NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic has produced some strange political alignments. There aren't many causes that Bill Clinton and Jesse Helms can both support, or that Phyllis Schlafly and the editors of The Nation can join in opposing.

Even stranger, to a historian, is the consensus that seems to be shaping up within our community. Historians normally don't agree on much, whether it is about the origins of the Peloponnesian War or the end of the cold war. And yet I've had difficulty finding any colleagues who think NATO expansion is a good idea. Indeed, I can recall no other moment when there was less support in

our profession for a government policy.

A striking gap has opened, therefore, between those who make grand strategy and those who reflect on it. On this issue, at least, official and accumulated wisdom are pointing in very different directions.

This has happened, I think, because the Clinton Administration has failed to answer a few simple questions:

Why exclude the Russians? One of the few propositions on which historians tend to agree is that peace settlements work best when they include rather than exclude former adversaries. Within three years after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the victors had brought France back within the concert of Europe. Within six years of their surrender in 1945, Germany and Japan were firmly within American-designed security alliances. Both settlements survived for decades. The post-World War I settlement, however, excluded Germany. The lessons of history on this point seem obvious.

Who, then, will we include? The Administration has made it clear that expansion will not stop with Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. It has mentioned the Baltics and Romania as possible future members. The State Department's Web site claims support for NATO expansion from groups like the Belorussian Congress Committee of America, the Ukrainian National Association and the Armenian Assembly of America.

The State Department assures us, though, that the Russians view this process with equanimity and that we can expect relations with Moscow to proceed normally while we sort out just who the new members of NATO will be. Perhaps it will next try to tell us that pigs can fly.

What will expansion cost? The Administration's estimate for including Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic comes to only $1.5 billion over the next 10 years, of which the United States would pay $400 million. That sounds like a bargain, but the estimate assumes no change in the current security environment. Has it occurred to the Administration that the act of expanding NATO, especially if former Soviet states are included, could itself alter the current security environment? It doesn't take a rocket scientist -- or even a historian -- to figure out that actions have consequences.

What's the objective? Alliances are means to ends, not ends in themselves. NATO served brilliantly as a means of containing the Soviet Union, but the Administration has specified no comparably clear goal that would justify expanding the alliance now that the cold war is over. It speaks vaguely of the need for democratization and stabilization, but if these objectives inform its policy, shouldn't they apply throughout Eastern Europe and in Russia as well?

I heard a very different explanation from influential government and academic figures when I visited one of the proposed new member countries last month. NATO expansion, they boasted, will demonstrate once and for all that the Russians never have been and never will be part of European civilization. Yet Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that she wants to erase "the line that once so cruelly and arbitrarily divided Europe." It is not at all clear how this policy will produce that result.

Isn't it too late now to change course? Some argue that even if the decision to expand NATO wasn't the most thoughtful, historically aware way to make policy, the decision has been made and going back on it would be a disaster far greater than the problems NATO expansion itself will bring. This sounds a little like the refusal of the Titanic's captain to cut his ship's speed when told there were icebergs ahead. Consistency is a fine idea most of the time, but there are moments when it's just plain irresponsible.

Only future historians will be able to say whether this is such a moment. But the mood of current historians should not give the Administration -- or those senators who plan to vote this week for NATO expansion -- very much comfort.

John Lewis Gaddis is a professor of history at Yale University.

Washington Post April 26, 1998 Pg. C6

Down to the Wire

The NATO enlargement battle is coming to its conclusion. Head counts point to Senate ratification of this weighty and far-reaching Clinton administration initiative. Intellectually if not politically, however, there is still a feeling that the result could go either way. The debate itself has been faulted, by the likely losers, for lacking in rigor. In fact, the issue has been treated comprehensively, if not exhaustively. The chief lingering questions bear on the purpose of expanding the West's prime defense alliance and on the risks of possibly straining Russia's commitment to a moderate policy in the process.

Expansion of a defense alliance, in peacetime, is unavoidably controversial. The lack of a visible security threat puts the burden on the enlargers. But the case for enlargement is strong. Stalin divided Europe. His ideology and empire are gone, but the outline of a Soviet, now Russian, buffer zone remains. The democratic countries in this grey zone feel exposed to an eventual restoration of Russian power and to other contingencies yet unshaped. They reasonably aspire to a settled place in NATO. The American interest in welcoming them lies in reducing unpredictability and instability in an arc that has generated the century's major wars. The scant current likelihood of an actual danger makes it smart and cheap to buy the extra security insurance now.

It's not persuasive to argue that the security integration of Western and Central Europe is worth any geopolitical price, even the estrangement of a moderate democratic Russia. No serious person addressing Russia's current weakness can want to build in a historic grievance. Russia's unhappiness with expansion, however, need not disable the project. Part of Russia's necessary post-Cold War evolution requires it to consider the (to it) novel idea that neighbors have a right to a national orientation of their own choosing. Russia needs strategic stability, arms control and the other fruits of a sensible national policy as much as the West does. But the West cannot relieve Moscow of its responsibility to make its own match of politics and policy. Especially when NATO has gone to extreme lengths -- some think to alliance-diluting lengths -- to alter the alliance's procedures and its very structure in order to ease Moscow's enlargement cares.

These questions are important. What it comes down to, however, is the strengthening of the new post-Cold War Europe. Right now there are two kinds of democracies in Europe, one sheltered by NATO in the West, the other exposed to strategic mischance in the East. The Cold War was fought essentially to erase the difference between the two parts of a continent whose kinship and culture make it a central, continuing concern of American foreign policy. The addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic serves an American interest and obligation of the first order.

Boston Herald . April 24, 1998 Pg. 19

Rachelle G. Cohen

Guns, butter vs. base closings

Perhaps Janis Joplin said it best when she sang, "Freedom's just another word for nothin' left to lose."

Let's face it, when it comes to major military installations Massachusetts has been pretty well stripped clean.

Charlestown Navy Yard is a collection of condos-with-a-view and biotech firms; South Boston Naval Annex is an industrial park; Westover Air Force Base, gone; Fort Devens, gone; South Weymouth Naval Air Station about to become a shopping mall.

The state is pretty much left with a few high-tech facilities such as an electronics research center at Hanscom Air Force Base in Bedford, the Army's

Natick labs and some reserve centers.

So when Navy Secretary John Dalton comes here to preach the gospel of ridding the military of some of its unneeded bases, well, all we can say is Amen to that!

"Politically it's a tough pill for Congress to swallow," Dalton told Herald editors at a meeting this week, "but the longer we push this off, the more money we waste.

"We could save over $20 billion in the Department of Defense by the year 2015 and $3 billion in each year forward," he added.

The facts as outlined by Dalton are these: In the past 10 years the Navy alone has reduced the number of its ships by 46 percent, its weapons procurements by 45 percent, but berthing capacity (for ships and sailors) is down only 18 percent. The ranks of all services have shrunk by 36 percent, but after four rounds of base closings infrastructure is down a mere 21 percent.

Dalton makes the case for guns *and* butter vs. bricks and mortar.

"We have a balancing act to deal with," he notes. "We are concerned about quality of life issues and our ability to continue to attract good people. And the American people have made it clear that they want our economic house in order.

"We can't afford to waste money. That's understood," he added. "But that's what we do when we have unnecessary infrastructure."

Now if only the military would apply the same waste-not, want-not standard to its procurement of hardware, maybe there'd be fewer skeptics in Congress.

And even Dalton had to concede that efforts to take some lard out of military construction projects via the line-item veto last year were less than successful. "I think we probably could have done a better job," he said. "Next time I think, we'll be better prepared."

Those vetoes and the overrides came down to politics pure and simple. (Anyone want to guess why projects in Georgia were left unscathed?)

Now the Base Realignment and Closure procedure is designed to remove the specific closure decisions from politics, but a new round of closures must still be authorized by a currently fat and happy Congress.

"I know that wasn't a happy day in when we had to close South Weymouth," Dalton said. "You can bet I heard from Sen. Kennedy and Sen. Kerry. They weren't happy, and they're friends of mine."

But Dalton has plenty of "happy endings" to point to that prove there is, as the mayor of Alexandria, La., put it, "life after base closure." Many of those success stories are right here.

But there are other incentives.

That $20 billion in expected base closure savings, Dalton explained, would buy 12 next-generation surface warships and two new aircraft carriers (at $5 billion each) like the ones currently attempting to intimidate Saddam Hussein. The secretary quoted Oliver Cromwell's assessment: "A warship makes the best ambassador."

So put the effectiveness of the USS George Washington streaming into the Persian Gulf against maybe the sorry sight of empty bunks and underutilized barracks in Louisiana. Any questions?

Rachelle G. Cohen is editor of the editorial pages.

Shreveport (LA) Times April 25, 1998 Pg. 8

Dalton would leave his mark

**Our stand: Ex-Shreveporter shoots straight*

John Dalton has applied his hometown values to the behemoth in Washington, D.C., and as a result has contributed to a stronger national defense.

The New Orleans native who grew up in Shreveport by way of Byrd High School has survived longer than his modern-day predecessors at the Pentagon.

He became the 70th Secretary of the Navy in 1993 and likely will serve a year or two more before leaving the post -- and the Navy -- in good shape. He revealed his plans during a revent visit to Shreveport.

Given the controversies Dalton has faced, especially the aftermath of the Tailhook scandal, and the realignment of military resources, he has served with distinction.

The community from which he emerged should salute his service and look forward to renewing its relationship with him.

Dalton brought to the Navy and Pentagon an attractive mix of business and military credentials. He reached the rank of lieutenant on active duty and lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve, and also held executive positions in the banking and financial industries. Two years after President Jimmy Carter's appointment to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, he became its chairman.

President Bill Clinton picked Dalton to run the Department of the Navy in July 1993, and he's been steering the Navy and Marine Corps through often troubled waters ever since.

Dalton's integrity, openness, straight talk and courage have made him a leader in the military world, often dominated by privacy, politics and insider jargon. Last year, the National Security Caucus gave Dalton its International Security Leadership Award.

The Navy, in many ways, has been the leader at the Pentagon on modern-day issues, such as ridding the ranks of drugs, ensuring fair treatment for women and closing installations. He calls the Navy and Marine Corps "the nation's 911 force" because of its quick and effective responses in regional conflicts.

The Navy is also more businesslike because it now shares work with other military branches, such as the Air Force, and welcomes more auditing.

Yet Dalton forcefully argues the military could be stronger through further base realignments and closures -- not something most members of Congress want to hear.

But it shows the Navy secretary with ties to Shreveport prefers doing the right thing, even if it means saying the wrong thing to a politician. This brand of strong leadership is Dalton's mark on the military, and it should stick long after he leaves.

Chicago Tribune April 26, 1998 Pg. 20

You're In The (New) Army Now

They don't sleep in barracks, eat in mess halls or spend nights carousing at smoky bars "on the strip."

In today's Army, most soldiers live off-base in houses and apartments. On base, they sleep in college-style dormitories and eat in nicely appointed "dining facilities." After hours, today's soldiers are likely to drive home, help their spouse with dinner and their kids with homework.

In other words, life in the new Army can be a lot like life in the workaday civilian world. It even has anxiety-producing downsizings and shrinking retirement benefits, courtesy of a budget-balancing Congress. There are more women (15 percent of 495,000 active regulars) doing more jobs than ever before, and like the civilian workplace, it has more complaints about sexual harassment, day care and glass ceilings.

But the similarities to civilian life can be deceiving. Most of these seemingly normal "green-collar" workers are either getting ready to go on, or have recently returned from, extended deployment overseas. And today's deployments aren't rotations to permanent encampments along the Iron Curtain. They're to messy, violent, post-Cold War hot spots like Somalia, Kuwait and Bos-

nia. Which raises the timeless and fundamental difference between military and civilian life: the prospect of being ordered into ferocious, kill-or-be-killed combat. No matter how plush the dormitories or normal the off-duty routine, it is this prospect, and the unflinching discipline that combat requires, that makes the Army not just another job.

Several important truths emerge from the vivid portrait of the modern Army painted last week by Tribune writers F. Richard Ciccone, Joseph Kirby and photographer Jose Osorio. Here are two of them:

- A self-selected, all-volunteer Army has obvious advantages over yesteryear's conscript force in terms of morale and discipline, yet there's a two-way price being paid. The vast majority of Americans now have virtually no contact with the military, a distance that breeds more suspicion than support. Likewise, focused and disciplined Army professionals are speaking out about what seems, to their eyes, an increasingly lax and self-indulgent civilian culture. There's no danger yet, but there could be trouble on the horizon unless the gulf is bridged.

- The booming economy has intensified competition for quality employees at all levels, and corporate head-hunters have discovered in the Army a treasure trove of candidates who are well-trained and motivated but marginally paid. The Army is being cherry-picked. Rather than wait for hard economic times, Congress and the Defense Department need to retool military incentive systems to stanch this brain drain.

Neither trend, however, dulls this singular truth: The United States Army is an enduring, evolving institution in which this nation can take great pride.

Chicago Tribune April 26, 1998 Sect 13, Pg. 1

Pentagon embraces women despite scandals

By Michael Kilian
WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON—As far as the Pentagon is concerned, women are here to stay in the American armed forces, right alongside men.

And that means starting with their first day of training.

Sexual misconduct and related troubles arising from gender integration of the armed services have raised concerns about military men and women training and serving in close contact with one another.

The concerns have led to calls for segregation of the sexes, at least during training, and to a policy of "don't talk, don't touch" as guidance for male-female military relationships.

The Navy's 1991 Tailhook scandal, the Air Force's sordid Kelly Flinn affair, the Army's Aberdeen training center sex scandals and the recent sexual misconduct court-martial of Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney, once the highest ranking enlisted man in the Army, have provided ammunition for traditionalists opposed to having women shoot guns as soldiers, sailors and airmen — or even having women in the military at all.

The drive to separate the sexes at least in the training phase of military service received a big boost earlier this year when it was recommended by a special task force studying military gender problems headed by Nancy Kassebaum Baker, a Kansas Republican who retired from the U.S. Senate last year.

Legislation to end gender integration in training was introduced by Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R-Md.) but failed to get out of committee.

In February, Defense Secretary William Cohen rejected the Kassebaum task force's call to train men and women separately, though he did agree that they should be housed separately during training (if only on different barracks floors).

"My concern is that we have separateness of living conditions as such," Cohen said. "If it can be achieved through separate facilities, then we should do that. If it cannot and is inconsistent with the training methods adopted by the services, then we will keep them in the same buildings."

He accepted the Kassebaum group's recommendation for increasing the numbers of female military recruiters and drill instructors and for toughening physical-training standards for women so they and military men would be on a more equal footing.

Leaders of the individual services echoed Cohen's response in hearings before the House National Security Committee.

"The Army strongly disagrees (with gender segregation of training platoons) because it is not in consonance with Army doctrine," Gen. William Crouch, Army vice chief of staff, told the hearing. "We integrate men and women in all but a handful of combat specialties. For those military occupational specialties open to both males and females, we believe that team-building should begin at the earliest opportunity, at the squad level or its equivalent."

Women now account for 20 percent of the strength of all armed forces, a percentage that continues to grow. The Pentagon high command has found women are better educated and score better in intelligence tests than male recruits. Arguing that their service is considered vital if the country is to continue to have a well-trained, high-tech, all-volunteer military, Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) and others have pressed for similar training and tasks for women and men.

Women are banned from direct ground-combat roles like infantry rifleman, but virtually all other military jobs are open to them. In the Air Force, they fly fighters and nuclear bombers. They're excluded only from submarine service and the SEALs in the Navy, where women now serve as skippers and gunnery officers on warships. In all, more than 80 percent of all military jobs are now open to women, a numerical increase of 250,000 additional slots since President Clinton and Congress relaxed exclusionary rules in 1993.

This assimilation has drawn angry opposition from the small but vocal Center for Military Readiness, a lobbying organization based in Livonia, Mich., that concerns itself less with ordnance and squadron response time than it does with the presence of women and homosexuals in military ranks.

"The purpose of basic training is not to advance a civilian feminist agenda, or to teach men and women to get along, but to impose a cultural shock that transforms young civilians — many of whom have not experienced real discipline before — into uniformed members of the armed forces," the center's head, Elaine Donnelly, told the House committee. "In 1992, the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces, on which I served, found that gender-integrated basic training was a failure. . . . Men were not attaining their full potential because they were not being physically challenged enough, and women were suffering injuries at far greater rates than men. That should have settled the issue."

Donnelly characterized sexual misconduct arising from gender integration as a massive, insoluble problem.

"Coed training and sleeping arrangements have led to rampant

sexual indiscipline at Army training bases around the country," she said, "universal bewilderment about appropriate behavior, gender-normed standards that reduce the challenge for men, an alarming decline in recruiting numbers (except in the Marine Corps) and serious deficiencies in advanced training that may be related to distractions in basic training."

The American Legion, which has a special section dealing with female veterans' issues, also opposed gender-integrated training as a detriment to readiness.

"The American Legion was appalled at the numerous cases of alleged sexual assaults, sexual harassment and the continued existence of sexual prejudice which have occurred recently throughout the services, primarily at training centers," Legion Deputy Director D. Michael Duggan told the House committee. "The underlying purpose and mission of basic training, indeed any military training, is readiness."

But a study last year by the Rand Corporation, a Defense Department research resource, made a contrary finding:

"When compared with the effects of training, operational tempo, leadership and materiel, gender is not perceived as affecting readiness," Rand found. "Pregnancy can affect the deployability of a unit when the unit has a disproportionate number of women or is understaffed. In terms of the quality of women, the majority of officers and experienced enlisted personnel surveyed asserted that women perform about as well as men do."

Adm. Donald Pilling, vice chief of naval operations, disagreed with the Kassebaum group's recommendations.

"The success rates of divisions in training competition do not confirm the (Kassebaum) committee's conclusions with regard to gender integrated divisions," he told the House members. "In the last 12 months, mixed gender divisions have approximately the same success rate as non-integrated."

The Air Force strongly supported mixed-gender training.

"We in the Air Force believe we should train like we operate day-to-day," said Gen. Ralph Eberhart, Air Force vice chief of staff. "The system the Air Force employs at basic military training reflects operational reality — men and women working together to accomplish the mission."

Bartlett has vowed to reintroduce his legislation by means of attaching it as an amendment to this year's defense authorization bill.

"I am extremely disappointed in Secretary Cohen's proposals," he said. "His decision to pass on making a decision on the heart of the Kassebaum report: separating the sexes at the operational level of basic training, is irresponsible. We simply cannot continue to bow at the altar of political correctness."

But Bartlett's effort faces strong opposition from Snowe, a formidable member of the Senate Armed Service Committee.

"I believe troops should train the way they fight and fight the way they train, and the Secretary's (Cohen's) comments indicate that this practice will continue in the Army, Navy and Air Force as it has in the past," Snowe said. "I was gratified by the Secretary's statement that artificial gender barriers cannot divide the Armed Forces of the future. The solution to crimes like sexual harassment should focus on improving the leadership of commanders — not by forbidding contact between men and women in the military."

Washington Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 6

INSIDE THE RING

by Ernest Blazar

Loyal dissent

An organization that can order men and women to their deaths is understandably better at training its people to follow — not question — orders.

What, then, is the proper role of dissent in a military organization?

"Dissent is for serving officers a blood sport," said P.T. Deutermann, a retired Navy captain and author. "There is no *proper* role for dissent in the military," he said of the U.S. military's unwillingness to accept criticism from within the ranks. "There is only an improper role."

A trio of military experts, including Mr. Deutermann, met to discuss this question at a conference last week at the U.S. Naval Academy. They agreed the U.S. military needs dissent, but that it will always be unwelcome and dangerous to practitioners.

The U.S. military teaches that lesson to American junior officers every day, Mr. Deutermann contended. "A strategy of stifling dissent, a strategy of yes men ... a history of senior officers speaking about how bad it is but who remain in power and do not resign as a matter of principle, instructs the up-and-comers how it really is: You keep your mouth shut or you pay the consequences."

Marine Maj. Gen. Tom Wilkerson, head of all Marine reservists, said the British military has a healthy history of officers who resign in principle to later speak their voice. But "we don't see a large number of senior officers leaping over the sides in the history of the United States," he said. "In fact, we see damn few."

He argued it is a commander's responsibility to foster a climate in which subordinates feel free to speak out.

"It takes courage," said retired Navy Adm. Leon Edney. "It should be an important part of a healthy armed force." After all, said the former vice chief of naval operations, "If we lie to ourselves, then we are laying the seeds for our own destruction.

Loyal dissent, that is, telling the truth, however unpleasantly it is accepted or dealt with, has an important role in keeping the U.S. military honest, the trio agreed.

Freudian ship

Navy Secretary John Dalton honors former President Jimmy Carter at 1:15 p.m. today at the Pentagon by bestowing his name on the third Seawolf-class, nuclear-powered attack submarine. A Naval Academy graduate, Mr. Carter served aboard submarines and gave Mr. Dalton his first political job.

The move has caused not a slight amount of clucking in Navy circles, members of which recall the disdain top Navy admirals in the 1970s held for the former president. For many who served then, Mr. Carter is at fault for having presided over the hollowing-out of the U.S. military. Similarly, many today blame Mr. Carter's Democratic successor, Bill Clinton, for repeating the same offense.

Today's event then, confirms for some naval officers their suspicion that Clinton-appointee Dalton is — at best — politically tone deaf. "If that is Dalton's legacy, then God help us," said one.

Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon regretted that Defense Secretary William S. Cohen is expected for a White House meeting and cannot join the public ceremony. Though, later, the Pentagon chief

"will meet privately with President Clinton."

Ahem?

"Carter. Carter," corrected Mr. Bacon. "He will meet privately with President Carter, Jimmy Carter."

General seating

There were enough generals at the table to run a war.

British-owned military publisher Janes Defense Group hosted a number of military men at the Saturday night White House correspondents dinner.

Among them: Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Air Force Gen. Joe Ralston, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence Air Force Gen. John Gordon, Army Lt. Gen. Peter J. Schoomaker, head of U.S. Special Operations Command and Air Force Lt. Gen. Kenneth A. Minihan, National Security Agency chief.

Spin cycle

The Navy's outgoing top spokesman, Rear Adm. Kendell M. Pease Jr., will receive the Navy's highest peacetime award, the Distinguished Service Medal, at the Pentagon today at noon.

Media liaison during some of the Navy's stormiest seas — Tailhook and the 1996 suicide of Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Mike Boorda — Adm. Pease always inserted a positive Navy message in his frequent talks with reporters.

He also nixed many negative stories. A reporter once said that if a potential story contained a crack of doubt, only Adm. Pease could turn it into "the Grand Canyon."

His influence on the Navy — dragging it into the media age — was far greater than his two-star rank implied. Later this month, he becomes top spokesman for General Dynamics.

Too many chefs

Operation Auburn Endeavor, last week's movement of 11 pounds of weapons-grade uranium — one nuke's worth — from the Republic of Georgia was over two years in the making.

Why did it take so long?

Count the number of government agencies and departments involved: Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Energy, the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the U.S. European Command and the Central Intelligence Agency.

And that's the U.S. government when it's moving quickly.

• *Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 or by e-mail at blazar@twtmail.com.*

Washington Times April 25, 1998 Pg. 10

Greeks take umbrage at U.S. efforts to defuse tension

Athens sees peace moves as favoring old enemy, Turkey

By Andrew Borowiec
The Washington Times

NICOSIA, Cyprus - Washington's recent efforts to defuse tension in the eastern Mediterranean have raised a barrage of Greek accusations and questions about America's intentions.

After a trip to the area by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, the United States has been accused by politicians and editorialists of being a "meddler," an "arms merchant" and Turkey's "guardian and patron."

The Hellenes from Athens to Cyprus are also cautioning against the mediation efforts by Richard Holbrooke, President Clinton's high-profile envoy trying to broker an agreement between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Mr. Holbrooke has been accused of being pro-Turkish.

At the same time, however, government officials in Athens and in the Greek-speaking part of Cyprus have reiterated their desire to see an even greater U.S. role in the area, apparently feeling that only Washington can prevent hostilities between Greece and Turkey.

While in Athens for talks with his Greek counterpart, Defense Minister Akis Tsohatzopoulos, Mr. Cohen called on the two traditional antagonists to scale down their rhetoric, "meet and discuss, keep the channels open."

But shortly after he left Athens, Greece said it would never discuss the long-standing territorial dispute with Turkey over the Aegean Sea shelf, which the Turks regard as an extension of their Anatolian landmass.

Equally, Greece repeated its backing for the planned purchase by Cyprus of Russian S-300 anti-aircraft missiles, saying, "They are defensive weapons and pose no threat to Turkey." The Turkish government feels that such weapons would be too close to its ports, military bases and, above all, its expeditionary corps in northern Cyprus.

Just as the Cyprus dispute remains unsolved, the conflicting claims in the Aegean show no signs of abating.

The Aegean lies between the western coast of Turkey and the eastern coast of Greece. It is dotted with Greek islands, some of them mere rocks protruding from the emerald water. Their proximity to Turkey makes the situation precarious.

Greece claims 34 percent of the sea's area, and Turkey, which controls two islands, claims 8.5 percent. Although the two countries nearly went to war last year over two uninhabited islands, to Greece the main problem is the Turkish view of the Aegean shelf.

Turkey would like to establish the line dividing the sea somewhere in the middle. To Greece, such a solution would be tantamount to claiming possession of some of the islands.

There are some 3,000 islands in the Aegean, of which 130 are inhabited. In 1975, Turkey created an "army of the Aegean," with headquarters in Izmir. The Greeks claim that the bulk of the Turkish army - NATO's second largest - and all of its landing craft are concentrated along the Aegean coast.

Undeterred by the area's passion, the United States is currently negotiating a sale of sophisticated weapons to both Greece and Turkey. The sale was discussed by Mr. Cohen on his recent trip.

While Turkey is in the process of a $15 billion arms improvement program, Greece is to decide shortly on a major purchase including tanks, warships, aircraft and an early-warning system, all worth $4.8 billion. The United States is competing with offers from Russia, France, Germany and Britain.

Assessing the U.S. role in the area, the Athens daily Kathimerini said:

"It is to a certain extent natural that American interference should make us nervous when it concerns matters as closely linked to Greece's vital national interests as are Aegean tensions and the old Cyprus problem. But Washington's claim to counteract the desire for supremacy expressed by both Athens and Ankara is likely to be unsuccessful.

"The real problem is, of course, that whichever government comes to power in either nation always acts and reacts with its own political longevity in mind and not according to the historically imposed responsibilities."

In addition to being doubtful about the outcome of Mr. Holbrooke's mission, the Greeks are highly critical of U.S. Ambassador Nicholas Burns. Greece seems to see U.S. plots and conspiracy everywhere. A cartoon in the Ethnos newspaper showed Mr. Burns raising the Turkish flag over the U.S. Embassy in Athens.

New York Times April 26, 1998 Pg. 1

Clinton Expected to Back Plan to Deter Terrorist Attack

By Judith Miller and
William J. Broad

On a bright spring day last month, 40 officials from more than a dozen federal agencies met secretly near the White House to play out what would happen if terrorists attacked the United States with a devastating new type of germ weapon, government officials say.

The results were not encouraging.

Under the scenario, terrorists spread a virus along the Mexican-American border, primarily in California and the Southwest. After doctors diagnosed the epidemic as smallpox, the dreaded killer once thought to have been eradicated, vaccines were rushed in to immunize the population. But what appeared to have been smallpox turned out to be a hybrid whose hidden side caused profuse bleeding and a high fever for which there was no cure.

As the scenario unfolded, officials playing the role of state and local officials were quickly overwhelmed by a panicked population, thousands of whom were falling ill and dying. Discovering huge gaps in logistics, legal authority and medical care, they began quarreling among themselves and with Washington over how to stem the epidemic. In truth, no one was in charge.

The outcome of the exercise surprised some participants but illustrated what others had long suspected: The United States, despite huge investments of time, money and effort in recent years, is still unprepared to respond to biological terror weapons.

The secret exercise, officials said, also underscored the need for a sweeping plan that President Clinton is expected to approve this week. The goal of the two new "presidential decision directives," known as PDD-62 and PDD-63, is to enhance the country's ability to prevent chemical, biological or cyber-weapon attacks, and if deterrence fails, to respond more effectively to the mayhem.

Clinton's interest, especially in germ warfare, has been deepened by books, aides said. Clinton was so alarmed by one of them -- a novel by Richard Preston titled "The Cobra Event" (Random House), which portrays a lone terrorist's attack on New York City with a genetically engineered virus -- that he instructed intelligence experts to evaluate its credibility. Experts tend to disagree on the plausibility of such high-technology threats. But most agree that the danger will grow and that such an attack, if successful, could be catastrophic.

Administration officials said the president had become increasingly worried by the idea of germ-wielding terrorists who might cripple the nation by sowing deadly epidemics.

Clinton's personal interest, officials said, has become a powerful force behind a series of secret federal meetings and directives meant to bolster the nation's anti-terrorism work. Clinton has also asked the National Security Council if more money is needed in this year's budget for anti-terrorism efforts.

During Clinton's presidency, terrorism has emerged as one of the country's thorniest security threats. In February 1993, a month after he took office, a terrorist bomb exploded under the World Trade Center in New York, killing six people and injuring 1,000.

In March 1995, a Japanese cult, Aum Shinrikyo, staged a stunning chemical attack on the Tokyo subway system, killing 12 and injuring 5,000. While the group used a lethal nerve gas, it turned out that it had also worked hard to make biological weapons, a realization that a senior administration official characterized as a "wake-up call."

Then, in April 1995, terrorists blew up the federal office building in Oklahoma City, killing 168 people.

Apprehension about germs grew later in 1995 as Iraq admitted that it had built and hidden a large biological arsenal and was prepared to use it during the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

On June 21, 1995, Clinton signed PDD-39, which stated that the United States had "no higher priority" than stopping terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. More than 40 agencies vied for a piece of the new federal pie, eager for part of the billions of dollars that Congress began appropriating for anti-terrorism programs.

The General Accounting Office, in a report in December, faulted the government for a serious lack of coordination in efforts to counter the terrorist threat. For instance, it said there was no mechanism to prevent huge duplication of effort in some areas and inaction in others.

Richard Falkenrath, executive director of Harvard's Center for Science and International Affairs and author of "America's Achilles Heel" (The MIT Press), a new book on high-technology terrorism, also criticized the government's efforts.

"There is still no overarching federal blueprint for response," he said in an interview. "What you have now are mostly grass-roots efforts springing up in a wide range of agencies."

The government concedes at least some of its failings. According to a draft of an interagency study, government counterterrorism programs suffer from a lack of intelligence-sharing and a lack of information about what individual terrorists or groups may be plotting, The Washington Post reported Friday.

Last month's secret exercise, known as a "table top," the civilian version of a military war game, used a genetically engineered virus -- a mix of the smallpox and Marburg viruses.

Dr. William Haseltine, a leading expert on genetic engineering whom the White House asked to review the scenario, said in an interview that it was realistic. "You could make such a virus today," he said. "Any trained molecular virologist with a really good lab can do it."

But Dr. John Huggins, head of viral therapies at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases at Fort Detrick, Md., disagreed. "Most of us think it's many years away," he said, adding, though, that using the conjectural hybrid in a worst-case federal exercise made sense.

Administration officials said the scenario was purposely intended to inflict a substantial disaster so as to stress the system and reveal weakness in emergency preparedness.

Among the shortcomings, officials said, were that in such emergencies hospitals would quickly exhaust supplies of antibiotics and vaccine. One participant said that it was very hard "to get trained, immunized medical staff into an infected area."

Federal quarantine laws turned out to be too antiquated to deal with the crisis, and almost no state had serious plans for how to take care of the people it had isolated.

Plus, what began as a domestic disaster rapidly spiraled into an international crisis as the epidemic threatened to spread into Mexico.

Clinton's deepening interest in such potential threats, aides said, led him to request a briefing by a panel of experts this month on the genetic engineering of biological weapons and related issues.

For 90 minutes on April 10, he questioned seven scientists and Cabinet members about what a White House statement described as "opportunities and the national security challenges posed by genetic engineering and biotechnology."

"Although he had been up most of the previous night helping settle the Irish crisis, he was very engaged and asked probing questions," said Frank Young, former head of the Food and Drug Administration, who campaigned for better emergency preparedness when in government and who moderated the panel.

Other participants said Clinton had asked the experts for written advice on how to better detect, deter and address

the consequences of a biological attack.

Young, now a pastor and executive director of the Reformed Theological Seminary, Metro Washington, declined to discuss the panel's recommendations, which are expected to be submitted this week. But those familiar with the report said the panel had urged Clinton, among other things, to stockpile and develop the capacity to make antidotes, vaccines and antibiotics rapidly, adopt a system to verify that states are observing the 1972 treaty banning biological weapons, boost federal funds for drug and medical research, strengthen the public-health sector and streamline the government system for detecting and managing biological crises.

On Wednesday, senior officials told a joint Senate hearing that the administration may create a national stockpile of vaccines, antibiotics and antidotes to save lives in the event of a chemical or biological attack by terrorists.

The improvements in organization that Clinton is poised to endorse had provoked a bitter fight within the administration, with the departments of Defense and Justice opposing a key provision that critics feared would have created a terrorism czar within the White House. Instead, the directives now create a "national coordinator" with a limited staff and no direct budget authority, but wide powers to initiate action, secure aid and iron out government disputes.

The job is expected to go to Richard Clarke, now Clinton's special assistant for global affairs. His new role will be to strengthen efforts to foil terrorists intent on killing Americans or destroying the nation's "critical infrastructure" -- the maze of private and public institutions that provide power, money, water, transportation, communications and health services.

Under the system mandated by the new presidential directives, as described by administration officials, combating terrorism is divided into 10 areas: apprehension and prosecution, disruptions abroad, international cooperation, preventing weapon acquisition, crisis management, transportation security, critical infrastructure, government continuity, countering foreign threats domestically and protection of Americans abroad.

Pensacola News Journal April 26, 1998 Pg. 3C

Families of 72 Floridians still await answers from Vietnam

By Dexter Chambers
News Journal staff writer

Randolph Jefferson Ard was last seen alive March 7, 1971, in Laos ... Hubert C. Nichols Jr. was reported missing Sept. 1, 1966, in North Vietnam ... Horace H. Fleming III disappeared May 10, 1968, in South Vietnam.

For three decades the remains of these three Pensacola men have yet to be accounted for. They are among 72 Floridians still unaccounted for from the Vietnam War.

To ease the frustration of family members, the Defense Prisoners of War/Missing Personnel Office has been giving monthly updates in communities across the country. On Saturday, representatives gathered in Pensacola at the Hampton Inn on Airport Boulevard with the members of 70 families from as far away as Huntsville, Ala. All were notified of the meeting by mail.

Alan Liotta, acting deputy assistant secretary of defense, said the meetings are not limited to families of those who served in Vietnam.

Families of the unaccounted from the Korean War and World War II are welcomed as well.

"The objective is to share information and to give families an overview of our activities around the globe," Liotta said. "It's also to answer questions that they have. We have tried to bring Washington to their hometown."

Nationwide there are still 2,093 unaccounted for from Vietnam, with about 1,100 active cases.

About three to five bodies a month are being recovered from the country. The U.S. government sends about 100 people a month into the Southeast Asian jungles to examine sites in hopes of recovering the remains of U.S. personnel.

"We would like to move quite faster but we are limited to the number of people that we can send into the country," Liotta said, "and the identification process is often slow."

After all these years, 78-year-old Marion Fleming, the mother of Horace Fleming III, said that as far she knows her son died when his aircraft went down in a South Vietnam jungle.

"Some farmers began clearing the land and they discovered a pond with a U.S. military uniform next to it, a skull and several rusted guns."

Last year she was asked to supply the military with DNA samples. Fleming says she has not heard anything since.

"I don't know anymore now than I did to start with," she said. Her husband died in 1988 not knowing exactly what happened to his son.

Unfortunately, she said, ill-health prevented her from attending Saturday's meeting to find out the lastest information.

Archie Trimm, 69, of Morris, Ala., north of Birmingham, did attend. He lost a brother in the Korean War in the 1950s. His brother, John Edward Trimm, then 17, was stationed in Pensacola for three years before being shipped to Korea.

"When the war was nearing an end we didn't get a lot of information back. They just declared him missing in action."

Trimm was told Saturday that, sometime in December 1950, his younger brother probably was executed or most likely froze to death because of the light military fatigues he was wearing.

"That was my only brother," he said. "I often ask the question why him? Why not me?"

Relatives of those unaccounted for are encouraged to access the Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office Website at http://www/dtic.mil/dpmo.

Washington Times April 26, 1998 Pg. 11

Ex-U.S. general seeks eased Cuba sanctions

Sees Castro as charming, intelligent

By George Gedda
ASSOCIATED PRESS

Fidel Castro: charming, extraordinarily smart, a great politician who knows his history. The assessment comes not from a Communist comrade of the Cuban dictator but from a U.S. Marine general who retired last year as commander of America's Atlantic forces.

Not surprisingly, Gen. John

Sheehan's dovish ideas about Cuba and its authoritarian leader have made the general an object of ridicule in anti-Castro circles in Miami.

After a military career spent trying to keep Marxist-Leninists like Mr. Castro at bay, Gen. Sheehan now supports legislation to end U.S. restrictions on the sale of food and medicines to Cuba. He also sees Cuba as a military weakling compared with the era when Soviet arms deliveries to the island ran into the thousands of tons annually.

Once a frequent visitor to the U.S. naval enclave at Guantanamo Bay, Gen. Sheehan made his first visit last month to the real Cuba. He spent 8½ hours with Mr. Castro and a day and a half with the Cuban leader's brother Raul, Havana's defense minister. Gen. Sheehan discussed his experiences in a telephone interview from his Virginia home.

"What do you think, we are stupid?" Fidel Castro responded incredulously to Gen. Sheehan's queries as to whether Cuba produces chemical or biological weapons.

"We don't want to give the U.S. a pretext for an attack," Gen. Sheehan quoted Mr. Castro as saying.

The status of Cuba's military has come under increasing debate lately in Washington as the Pentagon puts finishing touches on a comprehensive report about it. Accounts of the report leaked to the Miami Herald suggest the Pentagon believes Cuba poses no significant threat to the United States, partly because of the country's prolonged economic crisis.

Many Miami-based exiles are appalled by the conclusion. Their worry is not about Cuba's conventional military capabilities but other types of threats.

Among the most outspoken critics is Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Florida Republican, who in a recent speech accused Cuba of participating in narcotics trafficking and the Clinton administration of ignoring it. He also said Russia has been monitoring American military activities from an electronic espionage facility in Cuba.

Mr. Diaz-Balart added, "Under the guise of genetic, biological and pharmaceutical research, Castro is developing a serious germ and chemical warfare capability."

When Mr. Sheehan was in Cuba, Mr. Castro invited him to investigate the country's biotechnology operations. "You pick the buildings," Mr. Castro told his visitor, mindful that Gen. Sheehan had considerable information on the subject based on his prior duties as a Cuba-watcher for the Pentagon.

Gen. Sheehan said eight buildings were devoted to biotechnology. In one he visited, he said, technicians were trying to develop an AIDS vaccine.

Two years ago, Gen. Sheehan ran afoul of Mr. Diaz-Balart and other conservative lawmakers when a videotape showed the general having friendly exchanges with Cuban military officers.

The occasion was a Sheehan visit to the border area separating the Guantanamo base from Cuba proper. Mr. Diaz-Balart and three other lawmakers expressed "shock and disgust" at the displays of camaraderie, but Pentagon officials said establishing trust at the frontier is important to help reduce tensions and defuse potential crises.

His Cuba visit was not a lovefest, Gen. Sheehan said. He met with dissident leaders and disagreed markedly with Mr. Castro on U.S.-Cuban relations and Cuba's shooting down of two unarmed Miami-based planes two years ago. "I had a great time arguing with him," the Marine said.

But Gen. Sheehan clearly views Mr. Castro as a moderate and even told the Cuban at one point of the need "to keep the hard-liners in Havana and Miami from doing something stupid."

In response, he said, Mr. Castro told him he was right.

New York Times April 25, 1998 Pg. 1

Iran Nearly Got A Missile Alloy From Russians

By Michael R. Gordon
with Eric Schmitt

MOSCOW, April 24 -- A truck laden with 22 tons of stainless steel that could be used to make missiles has been intercepted on its way to Teheran, raising new questions about Russia's determination to end assistance to Iran's missile program.

American officials warned the Russian authorities several days in advance that a shipment of steel, which they said was a special alloy particularly suited for use in making fuel tanks for Scud missiles, was expected to leave Moscow, based on United States intelligence reports.

But the Russians say that the American information was not detailed enough and that they were unable to stop the truck in time. It was impounded late last month after leaving Russia when customs officials in Azerbaijan stopped it from crossing the border to Iran.

Russia's failure to stop the shipment has become an issue in a broader debate about Moscow's promise to clamp down on the sale of missile technology to Iran.

President Boris N. Yeltsin issued a decree in January tightening controls on the export of missile-related technology to Iran. Moscow insists that it is doing its best to prevent the seepage of such technology to Iran and that the Americans are too quick to politicize the issue.

But American officials say troublesome cases still remain. "It would not be accurate to say they are stonewalling us," an American specialist said. "But it is a hard issue for them, technologically and politically. They want to preserve a relationship with Iran. Some of the cases have gone away, but others remain on the table for us to discuss."

The issue has important military implications for the Middle East, where Israel has expressed alarm that it may soon be within the range of Iranian missiles.

It is also emerging as the major obstacle in the already frayed American-Russian relationship.

American lawmakers have threatened to impose economic sanctions on Russian enterprises or institutions that aid Iran's missile program if Russia does not fulfill its pledges to block the assistance. But the Clinton Administration strongly opposes that step, saying it would disrupt sensitive discussions between Washington and Moscow.

"It's a very serious problem for our relationship with Russia and for the security of the region," Senator Trent Lott of Mississippi, the majority leader, said in an interview this week. He said the Senate would vote next month on a resolution to impose sanctions "if there's not major progress made in the next 30 days."

The United States has long been anxious about Moscow's close ties with Teheran. Washington has complained that Russia's plans to sell Iran up to four nuclear reactors will make it easier for the country to carry out a clandestine program to develop nuclear weapons, allegations that Moscow rejects.

But the flow of Russian technology to Iran's missile program has also been a cardinal worry.

Iran has begun a program to build a missile dubbed the Shahab 3, which has a range of about 800 miles -- more than twice the range of a Scud missile and long enough to reach Israel, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. The missile is based on a North Korean design, but Iran has also turned to Russia to develop the technology.

But the key question is whether Russia is cracking down as promised.

"The 13 cases which our American colleagues have so nicely informed us of have been considered, and we have

provided detailed explanations," said Yuri Koptev, the head of Russian Space Agency and the top Russian official on the missile issue, earlier this year. "In the cases where we saw some doubtful aspect, these contacts were severed."

But when Robert Gallucci, the special American envoy on the missile issue, met with Russian officials this week, a number of cases remained unresolved. American officials, for example, are concerned that Iranians are still receiving training in propulsion and guidance technology at Baltic State Technical University in St. Petersburg and perhaps at the Moscow Aviation Institute.

The Russians have yet to complete their investigations of enterprises called Polyus, which is suspected of providing navigation and guidance technology to Iran, and Ni Grafit, which makes material used to coat ballistic missile warheads. A shipment of the material from Ni Grafit was intercepted by the Austrians on its way to Iran.

The Russians have taken some steps. The Government has expelled an Iranian student who was trying to buy missile technology and intervened to cancel an Iranian contract with NPT Trud, which makes missile engines.

American officials say the case is more important as a political test of Moscow's will to act than for its military implications.

American lawmakers, who have been briefed on the steel incident, portray it as an example of Russian incompetence or duplicity. Russians say the critics are insensitive to the difficulties of preventing smuggling in a vast and unruly nation.

The case began when American intelligence learned about the plan to smuggle stainless steel to Iran. The steel can resist high temperatures, and Americans experts say they believe that the Iranians intended to use it to make fuel tanks for Scud missiles. American sources say it was to be transported by company called Moso.

American officials alerted Russian intelligence in March that the steel was to be shipped. But American officials concede that they did not know all the details.

The truck left Moscow several days later for the long drive to Iran and managed to get out of Russia successfully.

Azerbaijan notified the United States on March 26 that its customs officials had detained the truck at Astara on its border with Iran.

Officials in Azerbaijan say the shipping documents misrepresented the type of steel. The shipper was identified as Europalas-2000, which American officials say was a front company.

A sample of the steel was sent to the Americans for analysis. After Azerbaijan stopped the shipment, the Russian authorities arrested three men from Tajikistan in connection with the smuggling effort.

One American specialist said the case was complex.

"It is not clear that we directed the Russians to the right place," he said.

But Congressional critics are likely to ask why customs officers in Azerbaijan were able to stop the shipment when the Russians failed.

Two Senators who met with senior Russian officials on a trip to Moscow earlier this month came away with different impressions on Russia's role in the steel seizure case.

Senator Orrin Hatch, the Utah Republican who heads the Judiciary Committee, said the Russian Government "could have done better," but in general "jumped right on" the case. Senator Hatch said the problems with Russian cooperation stemmed form the fact that the Russian Government was in a state of disarray after Mr. Yeltsin's decision to dismiss his Cabinet a month ago.

But Senator Gordon Smith, an Oregon Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, had a more skeptical view. "They held up this incident as an example of cooperation on the proliferation issue," he said. "However, it is important for us to verify with whom they are cooperating, the U.S. or Iran."

Baltimore Sun April 25, 1998 Pg. 4

National Archives destroys records it was given to keep

Navy files in mix-up include radar, sonar, space growth

Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The Naval Research Laboratory boxed up a vast collection of its records last fall -- some telling of the development of radar and sonar and the early days of the U.S. space program -- and sent them to the National Archives for safekeeping. In a bureaucratic foul-up, archives officials destroyed them instead.

After a four-month investigation, archivist John Carlin, the government's chief records keeper, issued a 28-page report yesterday on what went wrong and promised to reform his agency's procedures.

But he stopped short of apologizing to the Navy.

"Established procedures were correctly followed in the disposal of these records," Carlin said. "Nonetheless, records of historical value were destroyed. Therefore significant changes need to be made, and will be."

Destroyed -- "pulped beyond recognition" is the archives' term for it -- were 4,200 bound scientific notebooks and about 1.5 million pages of correspondence and technical memos.

"The historical record of our nation's scientific and technological heritage has suffered a serious and irreparable loss," protested Rear Adm. Paul G. Gaffney II, chief of naval research, in a letter to Carlin when the loss was discovered.

He said the records "chronicle some of the most significant technical achievements in the 20th century."

Among them, Gaffney said, were records kept by American pioneers in high-frequency radio and the development of radar, the use of those technologies against Japan and Germany in World War II, "path-breaking" acoustic and oceanographic research, the early history of the U.S. space program with V-2 and Viking rockets and records of the first U.S. satellite program and rocket-based astronomical research.

An archives investigation blamed a breakdown in communication between the archives and the Navy.

While the archives thought the records could be destroyed unless they met all the specified criteria for their retention, the Naval Research Laboratory thought the records would be retained if any of the criteria were met, the report said.

From now on, Carlin said, an originating agency will be sent a notice by certified mail when records are scheduled for destruction. Earlier, the archives said it sent a notice, but the Navy said it had not received it.

The processes the archives and agencies use for deciding what to destroy "are almost entirely paper-based, inefficient and not customer oriented," Carlin said.

Carlin said he has sought funds from Congress to revise the way the archives works with other agencies to evaluate and decide the disposition of records.

In the meantime, he said, the archives will not dispose of scientific records.

Wall Street Journal Apr. 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Low turnout in Nigeria cast doubt on the credibility of Gen. Abacha's plan to restore civilian rule, including his own unopposed presidential bid in August. Legislative elections Saturday were a key test of the plan, but unofficial surveys found that few voted.

San Diego Union-Tribune April 25, 1998

U.S. plans no cuts in gulf forces

Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- Despite the Pentagon's eagerness to reverse its troop buildup in the Persian Gulf, the White House has decided it is too soon to ease military pressure on Iraq.

"There is no change in our force posture in the region, nor likely will there be anytime in the immediate future," White House press secretary Mike McCurry said Thursday.

At a meeting Wednesday of President Clinton's chief national security advisers it was decided to keep the 38,000 U.S. forces in the gulf -- compared with roughly 20,000 that had been there before the buildup early this year -- at least until the U.N. Security Council completes its regular review of sanctions against Iraq, said an administration official speaking on condition of anonymity.

Iraq usually toughens its rhetoric against the sanctions during the U.N. review period. It stuck to that pattern Thursday, demanding that the Security Council end its economic embargo unconditionally. It also accused U.N. arms experts of spreading "fallacies and lies" about Iraqi weapons programs.

The Pentagon sent extra forces to the gulf -- including a second aircraft carrier and other warships, Army troops, and fighters and bombers -- early this year after Iraq refused to open certain sites to U.N. weapons inspectors. The crisis was defused in February, and while inspections have resumed unimpeded, U.N. officials say little real progress has been made.

The U.S. military services are feeling a heavy strain from keeping the extra troops and supplies in the gulf.

McCurry was asked by reporters whether Iraq remains at risk of a U.S. military strike.

"We remain in a position to use the necessary means at our disposal to achieve the objectives of the international community," he replied.

He said Iraq was far from meeting all of those objectives, including conclusive answers to questions about the size and scope of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs.

"That situation has changed only in that the government of Iraq has been more compliant in allowing necessary inspections," he said. "They have not been fully compliant in meeting the stipulations of existing U.N. Security Council resolutions."

The U.S. military force in the gulf includes about 18,000 sailors and Marines, 9,000 Air Force troops, 7,800 Army soldiers and 2,600 other personnel assigned to headquarters staffs.

Baltimore Sun April 25, 1998 Pg. 4

Dalton pulls rank on Navy brass, OKs promotion of officer in crash

Collision of carrier, cruiser fails to knock careers off course

By Tom Bowman
Sun National Staff

WASHINGTON -- Nearly two years have passed since the pre-dawn collision at sea of the carrier USS Theodore Roosevelt and the cruiser USS Leyte Gulf, but the reverberations are still being felt in the Navy.

Navy Secretary John H. Dalton has reversed the proposal of top Navy officers, including the chief of naval operations, Adm. Jay L. Johnson, to remove a Leyte Gulf officer from the promotion list to commander, officials said. Six months ago, Dalton was embroiled in a larger dispute over the promotion of another officer involved in the 1996 collision.

Cmdr. Jose Vazquez Jr., 37, was the executive officer of the Leyte Gulf on the night that the USS Roosevelt aircraft carrier backed into it during maneuvers off the North Carolina coast. Vazquez -- who received a letter of reprimand for dereliction of duty but was not held responsible for the collision -- received his promotion this week after Dalton's intervention.

Pentagon sources said that both Johnson and the Navy's Bureau of Personnel wanted to remove Vazquez from the list. Rear Adm. Tom Jurkowsky, the Navy's spokesman, would say only that Dalton and Johnson had a "lengthy discussion" about Vazquez. In the end, they "were in full agreement on promoting Lieutenant Commander Vazquez," Jurkowsky said.

Dalton's spokesman, Capt. Craig Quigley, said only, "Secretary Dalton's approval of that list indicates his trust and confidence in every officer."

The disagreement comes six months after Dalton and Johnson engaged in a dispute about revoking the promotion of the officer deemed most liable for the October 1996 collision because he was in command of the Roosevelt, Ronald L. Christenson, now a rear admiral. Johnson won that battle after Defense Secretary William S. Cohen sided with the CNO, declining to recommend to President Clinton that Christenson be returned to a captain's rank.

While Johnson saw the collision as a single incident in an illustrious career, others noted that Johnson, like Christenson, is an aviator and might have been looking out for a fellow flier. For his part, Dalton said Christenson "did not meet the high standards of professional competence."

Then-Captain Christenson was in his bunk when the Roosevelt suddenly reversed without warning and slammed into the Leyte Gulf some 100 miles off Cape Hatteras, N.C., causing $10 million in damage to both ships but no injuries.

Some Navy officers and Pentagon officials saw a double standard in the Navy hierarchy's support for Christenson and its treatment of the two more junior surface warfare officers on the Leyte Gulf: Vazquez and the skipper, Capt. Coleman A. Landers.

All three received letters of reprimand. But both Vazquez and Landers were "removed for cause" from the Leyte Gulf after an investigation; Christenson, a 1969 Naval Academy graduate, was allowed to rotate off the Roosevelt before the investigation was complete. He is now stationed at the Pentagon in charge of the Navy's aircraft carrier programs.

After an article in The Sun last month about the dispute among top Navy officials, the Senate Armed Services Committee decided to review the Navy's decision to retain Christenson's promotion. The matter is still under review.

Vazquez, a 1982 academy graduate, was selected early for commander's rank and was groomed for command of a frigate or destroyer. But after the crash, he was suspended from both the promotion and command list when investigators found that both he and Landers could have avoided the collision.

"I'm glad the secretary of the Navy reversed the action and gave it due consideration," said Vazquez, who has a shore job in Norfolk, Va., and hopes to command a ship one day. "I'm glad that this part of the ordeal is over."

Wall Street Journal Apr. 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Prime Minister Chretien was met by Castro on arrival in Cuba for the highest-level Canadian visit to the Communist island since 1976. The brief trip comes amid eroding international support for long-time U.S.-led sanctions. "Isolation leads nowhere," Chretien said before departing.

Philadelphia Inquirer April 27, 1998 Pg. 1

Russian, U.S. feud looming over Iraq

At the U.N., Moscow is expected to try to limit or end the arms search. The move will be fought.

By Richard Parker
INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — The United States and Russia are poised for a diplomatic showdown over Iraq's nuclear weapons that could help set the stage for another crisis with Iraq this fall.

Behind closed doors today, Russia is planning to press the U.N. Security Council for time limits on biological and chemical inspections in Iraq. And, as a reward for Iraq's having let weapons inspections resume last month, Russia will call for an outright end to the seven-year probe into Baghdad's nuclear-weapons program.

But U.S. officials, unsatisfied with inspectors' progress, will oppose any limits, and are trying to talk their Russian counterparts out of a resolution calling for an end to the nuclear inspections.

"We expect an effort to close the nuclear account, and we're going to oppose it," U.S. Ambassador Bill Richardson said in an interview. "There are still some questions about Iraq's nuclear program."

Less than two months after a U.N.-brokered deal averted war, progress in finding Iraq's weapons of mass destruction is grinding to a halt. Since arms inspections resumed last month, they have turned up no new signs of forbidden biological and chemical arms, despite suspicions that Iraq is hiding evidence.

Iraq's nuclear-weapons program until now has been largely uncontroversial. The U.N.-affiliated International Atomic Energy Agency, which has inspected nuclear sites since the end of the Persian Gulf war, this month gave Baghdad generally high marks for progress in nuclear disarmament.

But Richardson said the Clinton administration was concerned that Baghdad might be withholding information on possible imports of nuclear technology and that it had not fully divulged the extent of its efforts to enrich uranium. Enriched uranium can be fashioned into crude nuclear weapons.

If Russia presents the 15-member Security Council with a resolution ending nuclear inspections, a U.S. veto alone would force them to continue. But with most members of the council — including China and possibly France — expected to side with Russia and Iraq, a vote would hand Baghdad its strongest U.N. support in years. Only Britain is expected to side with the United States.

"If the Russians go ahead with the resolution, it would be a major coup for Iraq," said veteran U.N. diplomat Ahmed Snoussi of Morocco. Snoussi added that pressure on the United States to ease up on economic sanctions, which have cost Iraq an estimated $90 billion to $100 billion, would increase greatly when they come up for annual debate in October.

Emboldened by the inspectors' lack of success, Baghdad is aggressively pressing for an end to arms inspections and economic sanctions, imposed after the 1990 invasion of Kuwait. The Revolutionary Command Council wants sanctions to be lifted this week.

Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz last week labeled the arms inspectors' most recent report a "large volume of tremendous and flagrant fallacies and lies" all aimed at continuing the "unjust embargo" against Iraq.

Iraq will get a chance at the United Nations today to argue for lifting the sanctions, though no action will be taken.

"If we receive nothing for being good," said an Iraqi official on condition of anonymity, "what do we lose by being bad?"

The Clinton administration, however, does not believe that Iraq is trying to provoke a new military crisis. Officials believe Baghdad is laying the diplomatic groundwork for a fall crisis intended to pressure the United Nations to lift nearly eight years of crippling economic sanctions.

"The sanctions are what this is all about," said a senior administration official involved in Iraq policy, who spoke on condition of anonymity. "And we think it's obviously way too premature to discuss lifting them. We believe the odds are higher of a crisis in the fall than in the spring."

For the short term, tensions have eased considerably. Iraqi military units are at their home bases on routine duty, according to the administration official.

Washington, too, is considering scaling back its military presence of 37,200 troops, 29 ships and 355 aircraft in the Persian Gulf. With U.S. forces stretched thin worldwide, military officials said the Pentagon and the U.S. Central Command were considering keeping just one carrier in the gulf full time, instead of the two there now. The Independence is due in the United States in late June, and will be retired from the fleet just a few months later.

At the same time, the administration is fine-tuning its rhetoric. Officials have turned down the public criticism of Baghdad now that it is allowing inspections at previously off-limits sites.

State Department spokesman James Rubin last week drew a sharp distinction between Iraq's blocking inspectors — and risking war — and the failure to furnish the United Nations with evidence of biological and chemical weapons. Referring to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, he said: "So long as he refuses to comply on this critical point, sanctions will remain."

"Our rhetoric is related to what the government of Iraq does," White House spokesman Michael McCurry said Thursday.

Instead, the White House plans to turn up the propaganda inside Iraq, having decided to back Congress in setting up Voice of America radio broadcasts into Iraq, much like the broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain during the Cold War, the administration official said.

"A number of steps are under way to ensure the propaganda war is better balanced," said the official. Administration officials contend, however, that there is no fundamental shift in the policy of isolating Iraq — despite the costs and the increasing isolation of the United States.

"It's strategically important to our interests, even if it's not aesthetically pleasing to endure this constant probing by the Iraqis," said the administration official. "We've sustained this policy since 1991. We're not about to bury it today."

Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report April 25, 1998

Strain Is Showing as Military Tries To Do More With Less

Some lawmakers fear a return to the 'hollow' forces of post-Vietnam years, but service chiefs say the challenge is still manageable

By Pat Towell, CQ Staff Writer

Seven years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, U.S. armed forces are working harder than they did during most of the four decades of the Cold War.

The active-duty military is one-third smaller than its post-Vietnam War peak in 1987, but its units are being sent more frequently on missions away from their permanent bases. Two of those missions -- Bosnia and the Persian Gulf -- have involved thousands of troops and major air and naval forces for extended periods, and the end is not in sight.

By any measure, the armed forces are being stretched. By many measures, the strain is beginning to show. For instance:

**By October, the Army may not have any heavy armored divisions it can rapidly send to potential trouble spots. Two divisions kept ready for such a job may have a third of their troops on duty in Kuwait and Bosnia.

**Because of tight training budgets, many Army combat forces cannot conduct field training at their home bases in units larger than a company of about 200 soldiers. The number of large-scale war games at national training sites in California and Louisiana has been cut back.

**In 1995, fewer than 10 percent of the ground crew chiefs for Air Force F-16 fighters were fresh out of training. By next year, about half the crew chiefs will be brand new.

Many Republicans and some conservative Democrats on the congressional defense committees, skeptical of peacekeeping and similar operations all along, warn that the pace of operations puts the military at risk.

"We need to determine if we can maintain the tremendous level of involvement around the world at our current force strength and funding level," Senate Armed Services Committee member Pat Roberts, R-Kan., said during a Feb. 25 hearing. "I don't think we can."

To change the current policies or to increase Pentagon spending, such critics need the support of military service chiefs. So far, they do not have it. The generals and admirals trooping to hearings on Capitol Hill say that at least for now, they can take the strain.

"We are within an acceptable band of readiness and risk," Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry H. Shelton told Senate Armed Services on Feb. 3.

"We believe that we can make ends meet," Air Force Vice Chief of Staff Gen. Ralph E. Eberhart told a Feb. 25 hearing of the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee.

In 1980, Army chief of staff Gen. Edward C. "Shy" Meyer turned the growing discontent over military readiness into a political issue with his public warning that his service had become a "hollow army."

Today's congressional critics, convinced by anecdotal evidence that the military is closer to the edge than the Pentagon will admit, have been deeply frustrated by the refusal of senior officers to agree with them.

"At what point is someone in your uniform going to step forward and say, 'This won't do. Something is going to change'?" Mississippi Democrat Gene Taylor demanded of high-ranking officers during a March 11 hearing of the House National Security Subcommittee on Readiness. "It's only going to be believable if it comes from someone in uniform."

Skeptical of the official readiness reports submitted to Congress every quarter, critics added a provision to the fiscal 1998 defense authorization bill [PL 105-85] requiring additional data.

But in a March 18 House subcommittee hearing, the Army's deputy chief of staff for operations, Lt. Gen. Thomas N. Burnette Jr., defended both the basic accuracy of the reports and the integrity of the commanders who signed them: "Those of us that have been in this business for a long time appreciate that you entrust us with the lives of your sons and daughters. I would also hope that you trust us to report accurately and correctly and honestly."

Despite the complaints about readiness, there is almost no chance Congress will significantly increase the Pentagon's fiscal 1999 appropriation above the $257 billion President Clinton requested, largely because of the balanced-budget deal that many pro-defense lawmakers supported. Nor is there any sign Congress will force an end to the operation in Bosnia, even though Clinton has refused to set a withdrawal date. (CQ Weekly, pp. 760, 297)

Frequent Fliers

"The end of our rivalry with the Soviet Union has left us with a more volatile, complex and uncertain world," Shelton told a Veterans of Foreign Wars conference in Washington on March 2. "In the past four years, we conducted some four dozen major operations and today, in support of our national strategy, we have more than 50,000 troops deployed in 12 major operations and many other smaller ones, in dozens of countries around the world."

The Army estimates that, in addition to the 122,000 soldiers regularly stationed overseas, it will have an average of 30,000 deployed each day during fiscal 1998 away from home bases in the United States or overseas.

The number of Air Force personnel deployed away from base, which averaged 3,500 per day in 1989, quadrupled by 1996 to a daily average of 13,700. In that period, the number of active-duty personnel dropped by one-third.

At first glance, the 30,000 Army troops away on missions are 6 percent of the active-duty force of about 491,000. But since only about two-thirds of Army personnel are assigned to field units -- the rest are in training, supply and maintenance bases and administrative headquarters -- the 30,000 grows to about 10 percent.

Compounding the impact is the nature of the missions. Peacekeeping, for instance, requires different skills than war. Units involved in peacekeeping or other special missions have to train intensively before heading overseas, then retrain for their combat missions after returning home.

Ripple Effect

A rule of thumb is that each unit sent on an ongoing mission, such as Bosnia, ties up three others of the same size -- one recuperating from the mission, catching up on lost training and maintenance; a second preparing to go on the mission; and a third raided for specialists and specialized equipment to bring the unit actually on the mission up to full strength.

While many of the Army's overseas missions are of short duration, such as "Partnership for Peace" exercises with former Eastern Bloc forces, those in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf are likely to continue. And they account for roughly half the Army's projected daily deployments. Applying the 4-to-1 rule of thumb, sending 15,000 troops to those places means disrupting, to some degree, the readiness for conventional combat of units that include 60,000 personnel -- about 20 percent of the deployable Army.

The Navy and Marine Corps keep their combat forces on a formal deployment cycle. Warships, air squadrons and Marine battalions in amphibious transport ships spend six months at a time "forward deployed" in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf or the Western Pacific. They then spend six months at their home bases for

training and maintenance, followed by a six-month workup toward the next deployment.

Except in dire emergencies, the Navy and Marines handle new missions not by sending out more forces from home ports or bases but by redirecting those already patrolling. The impact is measured partly by scheduled missions that go unfilled.

When the Pentagon wanted to build up U.S. forces near Iraq early this year during a showdown with Baghdad over the right of U.N. inspectors to look for prohibited chemical and biological weapons, the Navy shifted two of its 12 carriers into the Persian Gulf. One of those ships was pulled out of its regular cruising area in the Western Pacific, where one of its missions was to backstop U.S. forces in South Korea.

Managing Morale

The stepped-up pace of overseas operations has boosted military morale in some cases and worn it down in others.

By all official accounts, the forces that make up the tip of the military spear -- those that would be first out of the blocks in case of war -- are as ready as ever.

Their readiness, however, comes at the expense of units in the second echelon that are intended either to reinforce the first group in case of a war or to handle a second conflict, should one break out. These second-echelon units have to absorb shortages of personnel and money while, at the same time, donating specialized personnel and equipment to units on missions.

Moreover, the full personnel rosters obscure the loss of experience as mid-level officers and seasoned sergeants are replaced in key billets with less experienced personnel.

Army leaders report that the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia gives unit morale a boost reflected in extraordinarily high re-enlistment rates. By contrast, Air Force fighter squadrons clearly have been worn down by repeated deployments in Saudi Arabia to patrol the "no fly" zone over southern Iraq.

"The key [to getting a morale bounce] is doing something the troops think is useful," said Louis C. Finch, until recently the Pentagon's senior civilian overseer of combat readiness.

"In the case of Bosnia and the Army, where they have a great sense of mission, you can see it in very high rates of [personnel] retention," Finch said in an interview. "With the Air Force in the Gulf region, there's sometimes less of a sense that it's a meaningful mission."

Though Iraq is one of the potential adversaries the Air Force trains to fight, the monotonous patrol missions -- successful precisely insofar as they are dull -- are seen by pilots as a distraction from staying ready for aerial combat.

The overseas missions also have a different impact on different parts of a unit. On a peacekeeping stint in Bosnia, for instance, an Army brigade's transportation, communications and intelligence personnel may be doing basically what they would do in war, and thus are gaining useful experience.

Indeed, because peacekeeping missions typically require small detachments to operate autonomously in highly unpredictable circumstances, the Army's Bosnia deployments may give relatively junior lieutenants and sergeants valuable seasoning.

On the other hand, key combat skills atrophy, such as the ability of commanders to coordinate the actions of several thousand troops in a battle or the expertise of fighter pilots in handling air-to-air combat.

"[Pilots] come back to their home unit having lost qualification in many of the skills that it took a long time to gain," Lt. Gen. Patrick K. Gamble, the Air Force's deputy chief of staff for air and space operations, told the House National Security Committee's Readiness Subcommittee on March 11. "That's where a professional frustration builds up."

Beyond the burden of the deployments is a hidden burden of extra hours and short weekends once a unit returns home as it catches up on deferred training and maintenance.

The post-deployment burden is exacerbated by aging equipment that not only needs more frequent repair but is more susceptible to breakdowns. The number of Air Force planes ready to fly on any given day has declined steadily from a 1991 peak of 83.4 percent to 74.6 percent late last year -- still far above the post-Vietnam low of 54 percent in 1978.

Higher maintenance bills, in turn, eat up money earmarked for training. One result is that units show up at the Army's major war game ranges in California and Louisiana less trained than they used to, though Army brass insist that the units still come out of the exercises with finely honed combat skills.

A grinding workload and a booming civilian economy have led some experienced officers and enlisted personnel with marketable skills to get out. Retention rates are particularly low for pilots, who are capitalizing on a surge in commercial airline hiring. The Air Force also reports a drop in re-enlistments by experienced maintenance technicians. The result is that many pilot and ground crew jobs are being filled by less experienced personnel.

Rules of Engagement

While senior military leaders acknowledge that such readiness problems are serious, they insist they can be managed.

All the services have established rules to ensure that units have a minimum time at home between overseas assignments. But rules to protect units do not necessarily protect individuals who may be moved by a routine transfer from a unit just deployed to one about to deploy. So the services have established rules to limit the frequency with which individuals can be ordered overseas.

Another set of rules limits the deployments of certain small, highly specialized units that exist in small numbers but are in high demand by U.S. commanders overseas, including certain types of reconnaissance planes. Crews of reservists have been organized for some of these aircraft to give their active-duty crews a break while meeting overseas needs.

Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Michael E. Ryan told reporters April 21 that the pilot shortage could be handled with an array of policy changes, including a reduction in the size and duration of overseas deployments, guaranteed time off after such missions, a reduction in the number of large-scale exercises and an increase in the bonus paid to pilots who stay in the service beyond the nine years for which they initially are obligated.

Ryan also insisted that the service's future was as an "expeditionary" force, geared to flexible deployments.

"We're trying to remold the Air Force into the 21st century, to be able to take on that challenge and do it at an [operations] tempo . . . that doesn't break the force."

Time
May 4, 1998

Unfriendly Skies

The Military Wants More Wild Blue Yonder

Although the military has downsized, vast expanses of federal land and airspace across the West remain locked up for training exercises and maneuvers. Now the Air Force, Navy and Army are pushing ahead in eight states to enlarge bombing ranges, airspace and tank grounds. Proponents contend the additional area is needed for new and advanced weaponry and maintaining combat readiness.

"With missiles going farther and planes faster, we need more space," insists Air Force Colonel FRED PEASE. But a coalition of environmental, recreation and peace groups says the reservations would create a giant supersonic battleground where low-flying aircraft and the flares and radar-jamming aluminum-silicon fibers they drop pose a threat to wildlife and motorists.

"Have you ever had an F-16 scream over your head at 200 feet?" asks GRACE POTORTI, director of the Rural Alliance for Military Accountability, based in Reno, Nev., which is joining a lawsuit against the Defense Department.

The most hotly disputed area: the remote Owyhee Canyonlands of Idaho, Oregon and

Nevada, where efforts by the Air Force to expand bombing runs are at least temporarily on hold until the bighorn sheep lambing season ends. --*By Richard Woodbury/ Denver*

European Stars & Stripes April 26, 1998 Pg. 2

Clinton nominates new strategic commander

WASHINGTON (AP) — President Clinton has nominated a Navy submarine commander, Vice Adm. Richard W. Mies, to take charge of the nation's nuclear arsenal. Mies, 54, would take over the U.S. Strategic Command if he is confirmed by the Senate.

Its current commander, Air Force Gen. Eugene E. Habiger, 59, has applied to retire effective Aug. 1, the Pentagon said Friday. The Strategic Command is located at Offutt Air Force Base near Omaha, Neb., and is in charge of the planning for potential nuclear confrontation. Its forces also do analytical studies for strategic nuclear policy and arms control matters.

Mies, a three-star admiral, currently serves as commander of the U.S. submarine force in the Atlantic and as NATO's top submarine commander in the Atlantic, based in Norfolk, Va.

Defense Daily April 27, 1998 Pg. 7

FORMER SECDEFs ENDORSE AIR FORCE's F-22 FIGHTER PROGRAM

Seven former Secretaries of Defense have signed an open letter that is expected to be released today that urges lawmakers and the White House to "fully fund" the Air Force's F-22 fighter program.

"Serious threats to American air superiority may arise sooner [rather than later], and the nation's security cannot tolerate a loss of command of the air," the April 27 letter says. "[Therefore] Congress and the Administration must focus on this fundamental reality, and fully fund the [F-22, the] nation's only truly stealthy air superiority fighter."

The letter is signed by:

- William Perry, who served as Defense Secretary under President Clinton;
- Richard Cheney, who served under President Bush;
- Frank Carlucci, who served under President Reagan;
- Caspar Weinberger, who also served under President Reagan;
- Harold Brown, who served under President Carter;
- Donald Rumsfeld, who served under President Ford; and,
- James Schlesinger, who served first under President Nixon and then President Ford.

The letter was drafted and the signatures collected by former U.S. Representative Jim Courter, who now serves as the chairman of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, a non-profit Washington, D.C.-based think tank. According to officials at de Tocqueville, the letter's purpose is to "increase awareness about the F-22's importance."

The F-22 is being developed by Lockheed Martin [LMT], and Boeing [BA], with Pratt & Whitney [UTX] supplying the aircraft's engines. The Air Force plans to buy 339 F-22s during the next two decades to replace the service's aging fleet of Boeing F-15 fighters under a $70.9 billion acquisition program. According to Lockheed Martin figures, each F-22 will cost $81 million.

The letter comes as lawmakers prepare to mark up their FY '99 defense spending bills.

In its FY '99 budget request, the Air Force asked for a total of $2.39 billion to continue development of the F-22. In addition, part of that request would fund the purchase of two F-22s that will be used for testing purposes before being made available to operational fighter squadrons.

USA Today
April 27, 1998
Pg. 11

MIDEAST TALKS IN DANGER: Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, frustrated by a lack of progress in Arab-Israeli peace talks, warned that "we are entering a period of grave danger" that could bring the Middle East back to its "grim and conflict-ridden past." Albright, speaking at a New York dinner for Seeds of Peace, a camp for Arab and Israeli children, begins an eight-day trip today that will be capped by talks in London with Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

— Lee Michael Katz

Washington Post April 27, 1998 Pg. 12

N. Korea Offers Soldiers as Movie Extras

HONG KONG—North Korea has offered 200,000 soldiers as extras to a Hong Kong film director who is set to shoot the first foreign movie in the isolated country, the Sunday Morning Post reported.

The Hong Kong film team believes North Korean leader Kim Jong Il, a film enthusiast and James Bond fan who reportedly owns a collection of 20,000 foreign films, is taking an interest in the project, the newspaper reported.

Director Jacob Cheung said the film is about a small state defended by a pacifist against invasion just before China's Warring States period between 475 and 221 B.C., the paper said. Filming would start in August.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)